This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

BT
836
.P42
cop. 2

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

UNIVERSAL SALVATION CONSIDERED,

AND THE

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT OF THE FINALLY IMPENITENT ESTABLISHED,

IN A SERIES OF NUMBERS COMMENCED WITH THE SIGNATURE OF

"OBSERVER,"

IN

"THE CANDID EXAMINER,"

A PERIODICAL WORK, PUBLISHED AT

MONTROSE, PA.

BY THE REV. C. R. MARSH—EDITOR.

BY THE REV. GEORGE PECK,

OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.—ST. PAUL.

Prove all things—hold fast that which is good.—SOLOMON.

WILKESBARRE, PA.

PRINTED BY S. D. LEWIS.

1827.

BT
836
.P42
Cop. 2

PREFACE.

AS it would probably be expected that the writer of the following sheets on presenting them to the public, would assign his reasons for so doing, it will be proper to do this in the commencement of this preface, and in order to which, it will be necessary to give a brief sketch of the circumstances which gave them existence.

An *Universalist Periodical* was commenced in June 1825, at Montrose, to be issued semi-monthly with the title of "*The Candid Examiner.*" On being informed that the Editor held a reputation for *candor & piety* above the common grade of those editors with whom he ranked himself, the writer sought an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the merits of his work. On examination it did appear that the general spirit of the work was more candid and temperate than most works of that peculiar kind. The principles upon which the editor professed to conduct his work, he stated in his editoral address, thus: "We shall not hesitate, boldly, to oppose those theories which we consider as false, whose deleterious qualities are poisoning the streams of human enjoyment, but we shall not intentionally give unnecessary pain to our most virulent opposers; and while we assume the privilege of opposing what we consider erroneous, we give those whom we oppose an opportunity, in this paper, of supporting their own views, on condition of using candor in argument, decency in expression & a prolixity compatible with the size of this work." (Vol. I. p. 2.) This proposition appeared quite plausible, and the language very moderate and pleasant: but being permitted to go on to his seventh number without meeting with ar

one who felt disposed to engage him in his columns, he came out in a style a little more ardent, as follows:—"We also would say to all our opposers that we are open to conviction, and that the columns of this paper will be gladly granted to their service, should they wish to refute the doctrine of its conductor. If our doctrine is as absurd and as unscriptural as they insinuate, it is their duty to show it. We then say again to our opposers if there is light in you let it shine. Remember that you must answer to your God for your criminality by permitting what you call *our darkness* to extinguish *your light*. Open and fair dealing comports with a good religion—stratagem and intrigue it will spurn out of its presence.—*Come then, let us reason together.*" (Vol. I. p 56.) On reading this warm and nervous challenge—very sensibly feeling the force of the *appeal* to our *love of truth, and of his warning*, that we "*must answer*" *to our* "*God*," &c.—not knowing that any one better qualified, would undertake the business—and supposing that the interests of truth required that *some one* should; the writer determined to accept the proposition. Though it appeared to be a matter of some importance to do away the impression under which his friends seemed to labour, that *no one dare engage him*, and to silence the clamor which had been raised through the country upon the subject; yet the principal object of the writer was to present his readers with a few striking specimens of what might be said in opposition to his system; and to guard the minds of the more serious and candid against his plausible sophistry. Believing that occasionally throwing an obstacle in his way which he could not effectually remove, would cause many to examine the subject more thoroughly—and so to see *the truth*—upon whom, otherwise, the *continual dropping* of his pen, would produce an impression favorable to his mistaken theory.

The writer accordingly addressed a note to the editor upon the subject expressive of his design in general. And how cordially he was received will appear from the following introduction which the editor gave him to his readers: "We welcome Observer into the columns of the Examiner, and promise him a candid hearing and all due *attention. His design* in coming forward is laudable, & *we hope if our 'bulwarks'* are vulnerable, he will bring

forward 'engines' powerful enough to 'demolish' them. (Vol. I. p. 102.)

The plan was embraced in five short numbers (the first part of this work) which the editor published promptly, sending out his 'replies' at the same time.

A rejoinder was immediately commenced (the second part of this work) and the articles were promptly supplied; & the editor proceeded in their publication, (though often with much delay) till he had finished the 5th number when he came to a pause.—And what was altogether unaccountable was, that he ceased to publish *without assigning any reason, or giving any explanation!* So that the public was left in total ignorance with regard to the cause why the controversy was so abruptly broken off. Indeed some of the editors friends were very ready to insinuate that "*Observer* had become weary of the controversy and had abandoned it."—Under these circumstances the subject was permitted to rest, for more than three months, when the writer addressed a letter to the gentleman upon the subject. In this the grounds of *complaint* were stated, and the editor was requested to enter into some specific arrangements for the *future*. And in order to bring the matter before the public, and to obtain his views, he was requested to publish the communication in his next paper—but *he did not see proper to comply with the request*. After a delay of several weeks however, he *condescended* barely to give notice that he had "two of Observer's rejoinders on hand" which on account of "their uncommon length" he had been obliged to defer publishing "to give room for other matter, which on account of promises, was entitled to a preference." (Vol. 2. p. 181.) Now as to the "length" of these articles, it will be but justice to observe, that the gentleman had not given the least intimation that the writer had transgressed due bounds in this respect—Indeed he did not even give notice that he had received any such papers, until he had been *plainly* addressed upon the subject. It is true that the numbers referred to, were somewhat longer than those which had deen previously published, the subjects requiring that they should be. But the editor should have recollected the *prolixity* of his *replies*. In replying to the *first part of this* work, he occupied more than twice the *number of pages* which *that* occupied. The rejoinder.

near as can now be ascertained, would not, but a mere trifle, if any, have exceeded his replies in length. It will now appear with what propriety he complains of the "uncommon length" of these numbers. It seems that he, in order to succeed to his mind, is under the necessity of requiring his antagonist to observe great *brevity* while he is excessively *diffuse!*

As to his having "matter" on hand which "On account of promise was entitled to a preference," it should be considered that, it was more than a year previous that he had positively *promised* the writer "a candid hearing & all due attention." If then he had matter on hand which was "entitled to a preference, *on account of promise,*" it must have been *promised* more than that length of time —but if this was the case it is marvelous indeed how he came to suffer *so much* matter, *of a more recent date,* to supercede that which had been *so long promised:* for certainly that which he published of this kind, within this time, fills no small proportion of his work! It must then be for some reason paramount to a positive "*promise*" that he occupied his columns with this kind of matter!

But he still gave some reason to expect that he would resume the controversy at some future period. For at the close of his notice he says "While the memoir of Elder Rich's life is continued, we shall still be obliged to omit these rejoinders." From this it would naturally be inferred that when this "memoir" should be finished he would resume the publication of "these rejoinders."— But, on finishing the "memoir," he announced to his patrons that "Peculiar circumstances obliged" him "to suspend the publication of the Examiner for a season." This information of course put an end to all expectations of his publishing the rejoinder any farther.

The reader now has the history of this affair before him. It has not been drawn up under the influence of the least unfriendly feeling towards the Editor. It appeared necessary, so far, to make a developement of these facts and circumstances, & the reader is now left to make his own conclusions. The editor courted a controversy in his columns—he endeavored to provoke it, by sending out one challenge upon the back of another—he was met on his *own terms—he gave the* most unqualified assurances of "*a candid hearing* and all due attention." The reader

has seen what "attention" he has paid his antagonist.—Whether the course he has taken is such as might have been expected from the high ground he assumed at his commencement—whether indeed he has fulfilled his engagements to the public generally, and *to his opponent in particular*, is now left for the candid and impartial to judge. The writer freely confesses that he thought he had reason to expect a very different course. He has indeed observed that it is very common among this class of editors to profess to publish the arguments on *both sides*—to send out their banters from time to time; and if no one notice them to conclude that the opposite party deprecates investigation, and from their silence to endeavor to reap all the advantages of a glorious victory. But when put to the test they discover a total unwillingness to meet their opponents upon *fair grounds*. They profess great liberality—their columns are open to *both sides*—but if they do in fact upon any considerations, admit an opponent, they subject him to disadvantages under which they are aware it would be inconsistent for him to maintain a contest.——These facts have long since occasioned the writer of these pages, to consider all their proposals of this kind, as an *empty show*. He did hope that it might turn out otherwise in the case of the Examiner, but has to confess his disappointment.

When this controversy was commenced the writer had not the most distant thought of its ever assuming any other shape, or going any farther than the pages of the Examiner. But just as the affair was assuming a serious aspect—as he was about to enter upon the defence of the *main arguments* in favor of *eternal punishment*; *his manuscripts were suppressed—he was no longer permitted to speak through that organ*. If he had succeeded entirely in that part of the rejoinder which was published, as it embraced but a small part of his design, and the most important part of it being still behind, his object was not accomplished.—And to leave the matter here, he considered, would not be justice, either to himself or to the cause which he had undertaken to support. Being brought to the alternative of remaining in silence, *under such circumstances*, or publishing in some other form, he chose the *latter*. And as a part of what he had written, alone would appear in a very disjointed state, not to say that

would be altogether unintelligible; he came to the conclusion to revise the whole and put it into a pamphlet.

The writer is aware that it will be the opinion of some, that as every thing had been done upon this subject, which is necessary or possible to be done, there is no *public call* for a work of this kind. Upon this ground he had much hesitancy himself with regard to it—but upon reflecting that the *old arguments* coming through new hands, assuming a new dress, and sometimes being considerably varied, seem to have all the force with many readers, that they would have, were they entirely original—that the most hackneyed arguments are supposed new, and those which have been answered a thousand times are considered unanswerable, unless they are met as often as they are resumed. These things caused him to determine upon his present course.

It appears to the writer that too much silence has been observed on this point, & some others. While we are indulging in apathy, the assertors of heteradox opinions, are making use of the greatest efforts, & are awake to the improvement of every advantage. Their *periodicals* are now flying in every direction through the United States. In these they rudely assail the fundamental doctrines of the Christian System. They challenge us to meet them in argument, and defend our system, if it is capable of defence—" If there is light in" us, to " let it shine," &c. And they do not hesitate to construe our silence into a *fear of coming to the light*—a conviction that our theory will not bear investigation! Now foreign from the truth as this representation may be, it produces its impression—it often, very often, has its desired effect! The passion for novelty is so general, and so strong, and many are so precipitate and incautious in forming their views, that there is no theory so inconsistent but it obtains votaries—and no sophistry so glaring but that, by some, it is considered as sound reasoning. Our opponents may be destitute of argument, but they supply the deficiency with *assurance and zeal*. We may treat them with neglect—may consider their arguments not worthy of a moments attention, that they refute themselves, &c. &c., but they have the adroitness to turn this into a mere pretext, to avoid an investigation, which we are aware would end in defeat. By these means many unwary souls are beguiled

from the truth and left bewildered in the maises of error.

Is this then a time for us to lie upon our oars? To treat these subjects with reserve? Surely not! Bishop Hornby observes with great force of propriety, that "The corruptors of christian doctrine have no such reserve.—The doctrines of the divinity of the son—the incarnation—the satisfaction of the cross as a sacrifice—the mediatoral intercession—the influences of the spirit—the eternity of future punishment—are topics of popular discussion with those who would deny or pervert these doctrines; and we may judge by *their* success what *our own* might be, if we would but meet our antagonists *on their own ground.* The common people, we find, enter into the force, though they do not perceive the sophistry of *their* arguments. The same people would much more enter into the internal evidence of the genuine doctrine of the gospel, if holden out to them, not in parts, studiously divested of whatever may seem mysterious,—not with accommodations to the prevailing fashion of opinions, but entire & undisguised." (See Hornby's Sermons, p. 4.)

Some may consider that the writer has bestowed too much attention upon the effusions of his opponent—that his sophistry is too absurd to require refutation. To such it should be observed, that his performances appear to be a fair specimen of what can be said in favor of his theory—that not only in his method of stating his views but in his mode of defending them, he generally follows some of the *great lights* that have gone before him—so that, if it is important that *universalianism* should be met and refuted under *any* circumstances, it will be difficult to perceive why it is not worthy of attention as supported by *him*—But, it is in fact not a matter of so much importance whether the arguments of an opponent are *weak* or *strong*—*logical* or *illogical*, if they do indeed injure community—if they poison the minds of any of its members If this is the case, the writer apprehends, it furnishes a call sufficiently imperious, to meet and expose them. And it becomes us as lovers of our fellow immortals—as watchmen upon the walls of our zion, to fly to the aid of *those who are about* to be *turned* out of the way, and if possible *wrest them* from the vortex of ruinous error.

In this humble attempt to defend what he supposes to be the truth as it is in Jesus, the writer has not the vanity to suppose that he is invulnerable to *invidious criticism.* It will doubtless be found to possess many imperfections, for which, he craves the indulgence of the candid; to whom he gives the most positive assurance that however imperfect or unsuccessful his efforts may be, they have originated from the best intentions.

It will hardly be necessary to say, that no claim is made to entire originality. The writer has read upon the subject very generally on *both sides*; and where he has found anything which answered his purpose he has taken the liberty to use it: always however, feeling happy in giving the author credit for it.

It was a source of some regret to the writer that he was under the necessity, in some measure, of altering his original plan. He commenced with an intention to write *popular essays*, and to avoid anything *critical* or *laboured.* Believing as he still does, that most points of the controversy, if not all of them, might as well be settled in our own vernacular tongue, as in any other—that after all our reference to the *original*, the same principles remain to be settled—the same laws of interpretation to be established. Though indeed the advantages of enlightened criticisms are entirely in our favor; yet as the introduction of words and phrases from other languages is calculated to perplex common readers without affording them any instruction; and as it was principally for their advantage that this controversy was undertaken, it seems rather to be wished that it might have been avoided. But as his antagonist was sure to launch out his *Greek* upon every emergency, it became necessary for him somewhat to vary his design in order successfully to meet him.

The nos. which were published in the Examiner have undergone some trifling alterations. The typographical errors are corrected—in some instances the phraseology is altered; some redundencies are expunged, & deficiencies supplied. But great care has been taken not to make any alterations which would effect the editor's replies or in any manner injure the force of his arguments.

But as the reader has been detained too long already *in this preface, it will* be expedient to bring it to a close. *The writer begs the further* continuance of his patience,

however, while he adds:—As for those readers (if any such shall think it worth their while to read this work) who have made up their minds to believe and support the opposite system *at all hazards*, he has not the credulity to believe that it will be possible for him to make any impression upon their minds. They are wiser in their own conceits than seven men that can render a reason—they are beyond the reach of scripture and argument—they have his pity and his prayers, and he must leave them to stand or fall to their own master.

But with the serious enquirer after truth he expects a different reception. To him he hopes for access—and would say *come and let us reason together*, you will be sure to lose nothing by a careful and candid investigation of this subject. It is a subject upon which very much depends, and which we should use the best means well to understand. I beseech you then to consider earnestly, "what is truth"—"what saith the scriptures"—"what saith the Lord"—and may the Lord give you understanding in all these things. And should this humble performance under the divine blessing, in any degree contribute to your instruction, and your establishment in the true gospel doctrine, and so be the means of promoting your dearest interests, the writer will feel himself amply compensated for all his labour.

Wilkesbarre, Sept. 7, 1827.

UNIVERSAL SALVATION

CONSIDERED, &c.

PART I.

Introductory Address to the Editor of
THE CANDID EXAMINER.

MR. EDITOR:—Not long since, the numbers of the Candid Examiner fell into our hands. Meeting with challenges given, and reiterated, to the believers in the doctrine of the final misery of the wicked, to come forward, in your pages, and *defend their faith*: hoping that many of your readers may be open to conviction on the subject, and that by this means, arguments may be thrown into their way which they otherwise would not meet with, we shall venture to accept the invitation. Not from any high sense of our abilities in disputation, but relying wholly on the goodness of our cause, and believing that truth looses nothing by a *candid* investigation, we do not decline the hazardous enterprise of entering into the camp of the enemy, planting our engines within their lines, and attempting to demolish their bulwarks.

We propose giving the subject a brief review in the light of the holy scriptures, and if from them understood as near as can be ascertained, according to the original intention of the sacred writers, your system can be supported, we are open to conviction. Our earnest inquiry is, and has long been, "what is truth?" May we all "know the truth," and may "the truth make us free."

If you do us the honor to insert this in your next, we *shall forward a* number containing observations on

views of the subject of *salvation* stated and insisted upon in your work. If we have a fair opportunity of being heard, we shall forward pieces for insertion, as we may have opportunity, and as occasion may require.

Yours, &c.

OBSERVER.

November, 1825.

No. I.—*In which the erroneous notions of the Universalists on the nature and grounds of salvation are* CONSIDERED.

Our observations, at present, shall be confined to a piece published in the 3d number, from the (Boston) Universalist Magazine, on the subject of salvation.

We perfectly agree with the writer, as to the importance of the subject, and the candor and impartiality with which our enquiries on it should be conducted. But to his views of the subject itself, we shall make some exceptions. He first speaks of the nature of salvation, to explain which he introduces two similes, which we shall notice hereafter. His views of this subject are expressed in the following words, "The salvation which God wills in our favor, is not a salvation from the punishment, but from sin itself." With that part of the gentleman's proposition, which asserts salvation from sin, we perfectly agree, but disagree with the part which denies salvation from the punishment due to sin. But he thinks it effectually proved by the principle that God rewards men according to their works. Thus he argues "If every man by his wicked works, has incurred the penalty of the divine law, and if the penalty of this law be endless death, must not every man be endlessly miserable? The fallacy of this argument consists in this mistake, that to incur and actually to suffer a penalty, are one and the same thing; whereas a penalty may be incurred and that penalty in virtue of certain considerations, be remitted, and so never inflicted. Our being rewarded according to our works, is not being punished, as we must have been without a mediator, but consists in our being rewarded or punished according to our having received or rejected

the mediator. "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

But our writer proceeds, "It may be said, that Jesus Christ, when upon the cross, suffered in our room, and shared and bore the curses which we deserved." Doubtless he suffered for sinners, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God," and "was made a curse for us." "But we ask, does this appear to be the meaning of those scriptures which explicitly assert that God will give every transgressor a just punishment for the demerit of his actions?" It may not be the meaning of them, because they are not speaking of the atonement made by Christ for sin, but of the consequence of the conduct of men in relation to it, so that these "scriptures," and the doctrine of atonement, are in nowise inconsistent with each other.

He continues, "If Jesus suffered the punishment of our sins, and saves us from it." It should be observed, that we hold that "Jesus suffered the *punishment* of our sins," in a qualified sense, that is, so far as public justice is concerned—and that he saves us from it on conditions. "We should find the inspired writers mentioning it at those times when they were telling what Christ had done for us." True!—And what is meant by his "suffering for sins." (I. Pet. iii. 18.) Being made a curse for us. (Gal. iii. 13.) Wounded for our transgressions—bruised for our iniquities—the chastisement of our peace being upon him—our being healed by his stripes, and by the Lord laying upon him the iniquity of us all? (Isa. liii 5, 6.) We leave the explanation of these passages to those who say that we must all suffer for our own sins—bear our own curse (or rather *remedy* as they would call it) endure the chastisement of our own peace—*be healed by our own stripes*—and that every man's iniquity, shall in every sense, be laid upon his own back.

Again, this gentleman remarks, "men have supposed God to be full of wrath towards his creature man; is it reasonable to suppose that the power which designed our good was full of wrath?" We do not suppose that God is under the influence of *passion*, of any kind. But the terms *wrath, anger*, &c. as applied to God in the scriptures, are to be understood figuratively, and refer simply to the incongruity which exists between the divine pe

fections and sin. And God's displeasure exercised towards man as a sinner, is by no means inconsistent with a love of pity exercised towards him as his offspring; such as influenced him to give his son to die for him, and ransom him from woe.

But we shall now return to his main principle, that there is no *salvation* from the *punishment due to sin.* And *first,* we remark that the principle appears to us inconsistent with what he has said in other places. His similes are either directly against him, or they speak the most palpable absurdity. "We say of a man that is taken out of the water half dead, and then resuscitated, that his life is saved, and our meaning is understood, he is saved from drowning. We say of a man that is taken from a building in flames, that he is saved, and we mean that he is saved from being burned to death." Now these similes applied to the subject under discussion imply deliverance from the punishment consequent upon sin, as well as from sin itself, or they speak this absurdity, the man taken out of the water must still drown—The man taken out of the fire must still burn to death! So his similes either overthrow his main principle, or they speak the grossest absurdity!!! The following sentiment may accord with his similes, but how it accords with his principles we cannot see. "There is no salvation but a salvation from sin, and when we are saved from this we are saved from all punishment, all distress, and evil of every kind." Here he expressly asserts *salvation from punishment!* upon which we observe:—

1st. This is certainly contrary to his main principle, which denies salvation from punishment altogether. 2d. It identifies the time of salvation (so he calls it, but it certainly cannot be a *salvation* from punishment if the punishment is suffered,) from *sin, punishment, distress and evil* of every kind. Now this goes to say that we may be saved from *distress and evil of every kind,* now in this life, which is contrary to fact,—or that there is no *present* salvation from sin, which is contrary to scripture.

Secondly, The gentleman's theory, is as inconsistent with scripture and reason, as it is with itself. We object to it, 1st. Those passages of scripture which make mention of salvation from that which must certainly be considered as the punishment of sin. That whosoever be-

lieveth on him should not perish," (John iii, 15, 16.) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." (Gal. iii. 19.) "We shall be saved from wrath through him." (Rom. v. 9.) "He that believeth is not condemned." (John iii. 18.) Here is salvation from *perishing, the curse of the law, wrath, and condemnation.* And what is this but *salvation from the punishment of sin?*

2d. It destroys the doctrine of pardon, or the forgiveness of sin. The two ideas of enduring all the punishment due to sin, and the pardon of sin, can never be associated in the mind If a man for some misdemeanor is sentenced to pay five hundred dollars, and endure twelve month's imprisonment, when he pays the fine and endures the imprisonment, he is free. But who would say that he was pardoned? None surely!

3d. It makes salvation depend on our own sufferings, (i. e.) enduring all the punishment due to sin. Consequently it is not of grace. Hence the universalist will bring forth the head stone of his spiritual building, with shoutings, not grace, grace, unto it—but punishment, sufferings, torment, the horrors of conscience, and the pains of hell unto it!!!

Finally, this gentleman, in common with his brethren, assumes that all punishment is amenditory. He says, "God punishes the sinner for his good," the punishment of sin is a means of salvation." Upon this we observe, 1st. That God, as a kind father, does in this probationary state administer corrections, that is, he often chastises us for our good. 2. The punishment he will inflict in his judicial capacity, in a state of retribution will be *exemplary*—not amenditory- As Sodom and Gomorrah are set forth for an *example,* suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. (Jude 7.) And we have no grounds from scripture, or facts, with which we are acquainted, to believe, that sufferings have any tendency, *of themselves,* to change the heart of man, but have many instances, both in sacred and profane history, where they have had the opposite effect. Without the grace of God sanctifying them, they have a tendency to excite a thousand unholy dispositions, to blow to a flame the principles of malice, envy and *revenge.* Nor have we any encouragement to expect *the assistance of* grace, in the future world, if we die in *unbelief!* Consequently if we have no hope but what re

upon our suffering the *punishment due to sin*, we must be in a forlorn case.

No. II.—*In which the true notions of the nature—the grounds—and the conditions of salvation are stated and* ESTABLISHED.

Having in the preceding number noticed some things on the plan of salvation, which we consider erroneous, in this, we shall give what we conceive a true and scriptural account of it. Considering 1st the nature, 2d the grounds, and 3d the conditions of *salvation.*

1st then, we shall give our views of the nature of salvation.

We shall not attempt to give the various acceptations of the term salvation; but shall observe generally that it signifies being delivered from *evil*, actually endured, or threatened. The gospel salvation is a deliverence from *sin*, and that impending ruin which is the consequence of it. In this salvation we shall mark several stages which shall be established by scripture.

1. It is a deliverence from that immediate destruction which man merited by the first transgression, and restoration to a state of *gracious probation*, which affords all the means necessary for his final happiness. This was effected on the first promise of a saviour, and secured the original pair, and all their posterity, from final condemnation for the original offence, and placed them in a salvable state. This is called by some divines *initial salvation.* We shall refer to a few of the passages which support it. 'As by the offence of one, judgement came upon *all men* to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life.'—(Rom. v. 18.) 'For the grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared to *all men*,'—(Tit. ii. 11.) 'Who is the saviour of all men.' (1 Tim. iv. 19.) Observe 1. The *salvation* spoken of in these passages is *general* or the salvation of *all men.* 2. It is actually received—the free gift *came* upon all men. The grace of God *hath appeared* to all men and he *is* now the *saviour*

of all men. 3. This salvation is *unconditional*. Nothing is said of any conditions to be performed by us, in order to the salvation referred to in these passages. Upon this ground we may conclude that all who die without *actual transgression*, will be eternall happy. But still something further is necessary for those who have actually offended, that is,

2d. A deliverance from actual and personal sin. The penitent goaler inquired, 'sirs, what must I do to be saved?' and they said believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be *saved*. (Acts xvi. 30, 31.) And Jesus said to the woman—(John vii. 50) and to the blind man —(xviii 42.) 'thy faith hath saved thee.'

Again, 'he is the saviour, especially of them that believe' (1 Tim. iv. 10) This salvation is also called justification, regeneration, being born again, sanctification, &c. And as to it we observe 1. That it appears from the above passages, to be a *special* benefit not the common property of all, nay of none but those who believe.—2. That it is a *present* benefit, to be received on our compliance with the conditions.

But 3d. *Complete salvation* implies deliverance from all the consequences of sin, and the enjoyment of a perfect state of happiness. Though we may receive the pardon of our sins, the regeneration of our souls, and be made the *sons of God* in this life yet owing to the infirmities of our natures, and the circumstances with which we are surrounded, the highest state of holiness and happiness at which we can possibly arrive here, compared with our triumphant state, is imperfect. It is when we are glorified, that we expect to be free from all evil of every description. 'He that endureth to the end,' saith our Lord (Mat. x. 22, xxiv. 13.) 'shall be saved.' We have seen what is the nature of salvation begun, carried on, and consummated. We pass to consider,

2d. The grounds or the meritorious cause of it. The meritorious cause of salvation is the mediation of Jesus Christ. In the character of mediator he, by the sacrifice of himself *made an atonement for sin*—which implies so to satisfy the demands of divine justice for it, that it may be pardoned by divine mercy, in a way consistent with that justice, on certain conditions. "St. Paul teaches this doctrine with great *precision*, (Rom. iii. 24, 26.) 'Being

justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed through the forbearance of God; to declare I say at this time his righteousness; that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.' From this passage we may remark 1. That the *grace* of God, as taught in the scriptures, is not that kind of liberality which socinians and deists ascribe to him, which sets aside the necessity of satisfaction. For grace according to Paul requires a *propitiation* even the shedding of the saviour's blood, as a medium through which it may be honorably communicated. 2. Redemption by Christ was accomplished not by a satisfaction that should preclude the exercise of grace in forgiveness, but in which the displeasure of God against sin being manifested, mercy to the sinner might be exercised without any suspicion of his having relinquished his regards for righteousness. *In setting forth Jesus Christ to be a propitiation, he hath declared his righteousness for the forgiveness of sin.* 3. The righteousness of God was not only declared when Christ was made a propitiatory sacrifice, but continues to be manifested in the acceptance of believers through his name. He appears as *just* while acting the part of a justifier towards every one that believeth in Jesus. 4. That which is here applied to the blessing of forgiveness and acceptance with God, is applicable to all other spiritual blessings; all according to the scriptures are communicated through the same distinguished medium, and are not less the blessings of grace on that account.'* (See also Rom. v. 11. Eph. v. 2. John iv. 18.) But our blessed Lord hath not only made an atonement for sin by the offering of himself but hath ascended into heaven to make intercession for us. 'But this man,' saith the apostle, (Heb. x. 10.) 'after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God.' We are then not only in virtue of the sacrifice forgiven, but in virtue of the intercession admitted to favor and grace.

---

*Gospel its own witness.—See the works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller, Vol. III. P. 156.

Finally, when Christ ascended to heaven he sent the holy spirit, to convict, sanctify, comfort, and direct us. (see John xvi. 7, 8. Eph. i. 17, 18. I. Cor. vi. 11. John xiv. 16, 26: Rom. viii. 14.) Thus he not only made it consistent with the principles of the divine government, by his atonement and intercession for man to be saved on certain conditions, but provided *efficient* means, by giving his spirit, to accomplish the work. What remains is,

3d. To consider *the conditions of salvation.* We have seen above that the way of salvation is opened, and all the means on God's part provided without any conditions to be performed by us. We shall now see, that in order to be brought into the actual possession of the benefits provided for us in relation to our *actual sins* we must comply with the terms upon which they are suspended. And these are *repentence* towards God and *faith* towards our Lord Jesus Christ.

Repentance is a Godly sorrow for sin which produces amendment. 'Godly sorrow,' saith the apostle, 'worketh repentance unto salvation not to be repented of.' Justifying and regenerating *faith*, is receiving Christ as he is offered in the gospel, as our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. What relation *repentance and faith* have to salvation will be seen in the following passages. '*Repent* and be baptized for the remission of sins.' '*Repent* and be converted.' &c. 'He that *believeth* shall be *saved.*' 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth *confession* is made unto salvation.' 'By grace are ye *saved* through *faith.*' What must I do to be saved? *believe* in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' (see Acts ii. 38—iii. 19. Mark xvi. 16. Rom. x, 10, Eph. ii, 8. Acts xvi, 30. 31.)

On these passages we observe 1. Salvation is the benefit proposed. 2. *Repentance and faith* are the conditions on which this benefit is proposed. 3. According to the order established in these passages, (and *many others*) the conditions are *antecedent* to the possession of the benefit. 4. The natural and necessary consequence is that if these conditions are not fulfilled by us we cannot be saved. 'He that believeth not shall be damned.'

We have now briefly stated our views of the plan of *salvation;* and referred to a few of the scriptures, on the *different points,* upon which they are founded. We are

ly believe our views to correspond with the general tenor of scripture. But if objections shall be made to them, we shall give such objections due consideration. And if any of the points above stated shall be shown to be contrary to the *record of God*, we will most heartily give them up.—We ought, *on both sides*, to have no other intention in this enquiry but to elicit truth. May this be our object, and may our labor be crowned with success.

No. III.—*In which the universalist arguments drawn from the will of God—general atonement—and the general terms often used in relation to the subjects of salvation, are* CONSIDERED.

In this number we shall conclude our observations upon the article with which we commenced, and in as brief a manner as possible.

The writer comes in the second place to "search into the extent of this salvation." And proceeds "First then we will observe that the will of God concerning sinners must be done; and as St. Paul informs us, that this is to 'have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth;' all men must be saved from their sins." The gentleman's error in this argument consists intaking *the will of God*, in this place, in an *absolute* sense, as implying an *irresistible fatality:* whereas what the apostle intends by it, can be nothing else than God's disposition to save sinners, and to make them happy, in a way consistent with their *free agency*.

That his argument is indeed false will be obvious on the slightest examination. "The will of God," he says, "concerning sinners must be done." Well, it is "the will of God" that they should not sin: therefore, according to our writer's logic there is no such thing in the universe as sin! If the minor proposition, which says that it is the will of God that his creatures should not sin, be supposed false, we are then driven to the conclusion that God hath forbidden what is *according to his will*, yea that *sin of every kind is according to the* will of the infinitely *holy and righteous* Jehovah! So we are forced, from the

principle laid down, to the strange conclusion, either 1st, that there is no sin in the universe—that all actions are alike good—and thus to level all moral distinctions at once; or 2nd, that sin, that accursed thing which the Lord hateth is according to his will!—and that though according to his will, he has still forbidden it! So this favorite argument of the Universalists, as it goes to prove what is manifestly *false*, or *absurd*, must itself be false! We believe that it is *the will of God* that all should be saved, *conditionally*. But we do not believe that God will violate the nature of man in order to save him!

Again, he adds, "Those who are included in this purpose Jesus came to save." "He gave himself a ransom for all." &c. That Jesus gave himself a ransom for the *whole world*, we do not doubt. He hath restored all mankind to a *salvable state*. And those who are not in a situation to understand the import of the *conditions of salvation*, or capable of performing them shall be saved unconditionally. And all those who are in a situation to understand, &c. *may* be saved if they *will*. They have a gracious day, and the gracious privilege of being saved.*—

*On this ground," says Dr. Strong, "the scriptures represent sinners failure of salvation to be their own fault. There is no difficulty in the way of their salvation now remaining, but the opposedness of their own hearts to such a salvation as is offered. They do not choose a holy Saviour, law and gospel, and a holy kingdom.

"It is in this sense that CHRIST *gave himself a ransom for all—that he will have*, or commands, *all men to be saved—that he is the Saviour of the world—that the world through him may be saved—that he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world—and that he came not to judge but to save the world.* It is in this sense that a door of mercy is really opened for all mankind. When we say that a door of mercy is opened, it doth not imply that all will enter. It only means that they may be saved, if they choose such a salvation as is offered; and that all difficulty, foreign to the moral state of their own hearts is removed. If they choose and their love be right, they may be saved; but if CHRIST had not obeyed and suffered, even though their choice and love had become right, they could not have been saved from misery, without a public injury.

"*It is this which* is meant, by all sinners being brought to a *state of trial* and probation. Every thing is removed

Hence the gospel announces "whosoever will, let him come and partake of the waters of life freely." But that Christ hath "come to save" *all men* unconditionally. is, in our view of the subject, palpably contrary to the scriptures. Some we are told, (2 Peter ii. 1.) would "bring in damnable heresies even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." So far was the inspired writer from supposing that Christ having 'bought them' would shield them from 'destruction' while they should reject him and his salvation.

The whole merit of this question appears to us to turn upon this point, is the salvation which Christ has provided, for those who have passed the line of accountability, *conditional*, or is it not? Here we join issue with our opponents, and appeal to the law and to the testimony. To this infallible standard of truth we invite them to bring this question for a final decision.

This writer finally attempts to support his theory by scripture. We shall now briefly enquire into the meaning of the passages which he has brought forward and see whether they afford him any support.

"The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together, Isa. xl. 5." This passage is a prediction of the glorious display of the divine perfections in the person and offices of Christ, and the success of the gospel among the gentiles. But it no more implies that all men will finally be saved than the words of Peter (Ac. ii. 16, 17.) "*I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh*" proves that all men, were actually saved on the day of pentecost, when he represents this prophecy as being fulfilled.

---

of the way, but their own personal unholiness; and when all foreign objections are removed, God places their salvation or destruction upon their own temper and choice. Before the provision of a Saviour, there was a necessary opposition between the best good of the universe and the forgiveness of any sinner. The wisdom of God in the gospel hath provided such means as reconcile the forgiveness of every penitent, with the best good of his kingdom and the glory of his own name; and no cause but the sinner's own perverse heart can frustrate the application." (Strong's strictures upon Dr. Huntington's Book entitled *Calvinism Improved*—See Eternal Misery reconciled with the infinite benevolence of God, P. P. 224 225.)

Again, he produces, "All flesh shall come to worship before me, Isa. lxvi, 23." This must be considered as an interesting prediction of the general return of the heathen nations from idolatry to the worship of the true God: but that it does not prove universal salvation is evident from the next verse, "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their *worm shall not die*, neither shall their *fire be quenched;* and they shall be an abhoring unto all flesh." Our Lord refers to this passage (Mark ix. 43. 48.) and three times in succession applies the words, "where their *worm dieth not* and their *fire is not quenched*," to the punishment of "hell." From the whole it appears that at the time of the fulfilment of the words of the prophet, upon which the universalists so much rely, some will not be saved: unless indeed, they can be saved and "be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched," at one and the same time!

Again he quotes, "All flesh shall see the salvation of God, Luke iii. 6." These words are a quotation of Isa, xl. 5. and the same explanation which we have given that passage should be given this.

He finally gives us two passages from the psalms as follow: "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord," Ps. xxii, 27. "All nations whom thou hast made shall come & worship before thee, O Lord, Ps. 86, 9." Upon these passages we observe as upon the former, that they have already in some degree had their accomplishment in the *calling of the gentiles*. And upon the whole of them we may remark that they shall more eminently be fulfilled in the general conversion of the nations, which is yet to take place.

But the general terms "All flesh—All nations" &c. are not to be taken in an absolute sense, for *every particular person of all the nations of the earth*. Such phrases are often to be taken in a limited sense in the scriptures.—Thus (Luke ii, 1.) "there went out a decree that *all the world* should be taxed," means the Roman empire. And in (Mat. iii. 5, 6.) "Jerusalem and *all Judea* and *all the region* round about," means great multitudes of all classes. And "the pharisees said the world is gone after him," (John xii. 19.) but they could only mean a great multitude. These universal terms, we see are often so limited

ed by their connections, (and this is often the case with those passages on which the universalists principally rely,) that to take them strictly would lead to the most glaring absurdities, and make the scriptures contradict themselves!

We have passed through the article which we took upon us to review, and are not conscious to have done the writer the least injustice. We have endeavored to bring to light the fallacy of his reasoning, and his erroneous applications of scripture. And what we have said, if it is not sufficient to cause doubts, with respect to the truth of the theory here opposed, in the minds of those who are open to conviction, will at least suggest the necessity of a thorough examination of the subject. We are aware that this article contains but a small part of what is alleged in support of the doctrine of Universal salvation. But it appears to contain a fair specimen of the whole; and as much as could be urged in so small a compass. If the *candid reader* will now consent to follow us (and it is for his benefit that we write) we will in our next, give him a specimen of the scriptural arguments by which our views are supported. We do sincerely believe in the *future punishment* of the *finally impenitent*, and that, that *punishment* will be *endless*; and we will most freely give our reasons for this belief.

No. IV.—*Direct Evidence in favor of Eternal Punishment.*

We shall proceed as was proposed in our last to adduce proof in favor of the doctrine of the final misery of the wicked; and we allege in support of this doctrine.*

"1. All those passages of scripture which describe the *future states of men in contrast.*

"Men of the world who have their portion in this life; I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness.—The

*In our arrangement we follow Mr. Fuller in his 5th letter to Mr. Vidler—we also retain most of his arguments, omiting such as do not appear to us entirely conclusive, and adding others which we consider important. (See Fuller's Works, Vol. II, pp. 265, 375.)

hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectations of the wicked shall perish.—The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death.—And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.—He will gather his wheat into the garner; and will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.—Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction and many there be who go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.—Not every one that sayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my father who is in heaven.—Many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—Gather ye first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn.—The son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their father.—And gathered the good into vessels but cast the bad away. So shall it be in the end of the world; The angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.—Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord. But cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come, ye blessed of my father inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.—And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.—He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. Blessed are ye when men shall hate you for the son of man's sake, rejoice ye in that day, and leap

for joy; for, behold, your reward is great in heaven.—But wo unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation.—God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.—All that are in their graves shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.—Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.—For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.—That which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned: But beloved we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation. To them, who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile.—For we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."*

"I consider these passages as designed to express the *final states of men*, and if they be, it is the same thing, as their being designed to express the doctrine of endless punishment; for if the descriptions here given of the portion of the wicked, denote their *final* state, there is no possibility of another state succeeding it," and if their *final state* be a *miserable* one, their *misery* must be *endless!* "That the above passages do express the *final* states of men, may appear from the following considerations.

"1. The state of the righteous, (which is all along opposed to that of the wicked,) is allowed to be final; and if

---

*Ps. xvii. 14, 15. Prov. x, 28. xiv, 32. Dan. xii, 2. Mat. iii, 12. vii, 13, 14, 21. viii, 11, 12. xiii, 30, 40—43. 47—50 xxiv. 46—51. xxv, 23, 30, 34, 41, 46. Mark xvi. 16. Luke vi. 23, 24, John iii. 16. v. 29. Gal. vi, 7, 8. Heb. vi. 8, 9. Rom. ii. 6—10. 2. Cor. v. 10.

the other were not the same, it would not have been in such a variety of forms, contrasted with it; for it would not be a contrast.

"2. All these passages are totally silent, as to any other state following that of *destruction, damnation*, &c. If the punishment threatened to ungodly men had been only a purgation or temporary correction, we might have expected that something like this would have been intimated when their future state is described; but nothing like it occurs in any of the foregoing passages or in any other.

"3. The phraseology of the greater part of them, is inconsistent with any other state following that which they describe. On the supposition of salvation being appointed as the ultimate portion of those who die in their sins, they have not *their portion in this life;* but will, equally with those who die in the Lord, *behold his face in righteousness, and be satisfied with his likeness.* Their expectation shall not *perish;* but shall issue like that of the righteous in *gladness;* and though *driven away in their wickedness,* yet they have *hope in their death,* and that hope shall be realized. The broad way doth *not* lead to destruction, but merely to a temporary correction, the end of which is everlasting life. The *chaff* will not be *burned,* but be turned into *wheat,* and gathered into the *garner.* The *cursed* as well as the *blessed* shall *inherit the kingdom of God;* which was also *prepared for them* from the foundation of the world. There may be a *wo* against the wicked, that they shall be kept from their consolation a long time, but not that they *have received it.* Those who in the present life believe *not* in Christ shall not *perish,* but have everlasting life. This life on the system here opposed is improperly represented as the *seed time,* and the life to come as the *harvest,* inasmuch as the wicked reap all their harvest in this life; or may sow the seeds of heavenly bliss in hell! and though he may reap corruption as the fruit of his present doings, yet that corruption will not be the opposite of *everlasting life* seeing it will issue in it. And though they bear *briars & thorns,* yet their *end* is not to be *burned* but to obtain *salvation!*" Finally, though the *contentious,* &c. may have *tribulation,* and *wrath,* and *anguish,* yet this would not be correctly opposed to *eternal life,* and they too shall be

rewarded with eternal life as well as those who patiently *continue in well doing ! ! !*—But we pass to add,

"II. Those passages which speak of the duration of future punishment by the terms *everlasting, eternal, forever,* and *forever & ever.*

" Some shall awake to everlasting life, and some to shame and *everlasting* contempt. —It is better for thee to enter into life halt, or maimed, than having two hands or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting* fire.— Depart ye cursed into *everlasting* fire.—And these shall go away into *everlasting* punishment.—Who shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.—He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost is in danger of (or subject to) *eternal* damnation. The inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire.—These are wells without water, clouds that are carried about with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved *forever.*—Wandering stars to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness *forever.*—If any man worship the beast, or his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone, in the presence of the holy angels & in the presence of the Lamb; & the smoke of their torment ascendeth up *forever and ever,* and they have no rest day nor night.—And they said, alleluia! and her smoke rose up *forever and ever.*—And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where the beast & the false prophet are; & shall be tormented day & night *forever and ever.**

" As to the term (*aionios*) rendered *everlasting,* or *eternal,* which you consider as proving nothing, on account of its ambiguity, there is a rule of interpretation, which I have long understood to be used on other subjects, by all good critics, and which I consider as preferable to yours. This rule is, *that every term be taken in its proper sense, except there be something in the sub-*

*Dan. xii, 2. Mat. xviii, 8.—xxv, 41, 46. 2 Thes. i, 9, Mk. ii, 29. Jude 7, 2 Pet. ii, 17. Jude 13. Rev. xiv, 10.—11, xix.—iii, xx, 10.

ject or connection which requires it to be taken otherwise.—Now so far as my acquaintance with this subject extends, it appears to be generally allowed by lexicographers, that *aion* is a compound of *aei*, and *on*, and that its literal meaning is *always being;* also, that the meaning of its derivative *aionios* is *endless, everlasting* or *eternal.* This term *aionios* which is very sparingly applied in the New Testament to limited duration, I always take in its proper sense, except there be something in the connexion or subject which requires it to be taken otherwise: and as I do not find this to be the case in any of those places where it is applied to punishment, I see no reason, in these cases, to depart from its proper acceptation. Everlasting punishment is in some of them opposed to everlasting life; which, so far as antithesis can go to fix the meaning of a term, determines it to be of the same force and extent" —So much for Mr. Fuller.

Dr. Clarke on Mat. xxv, 46. remarks, " No *end* to the punishment of those whom *final* impenitence manifests in them an eternal *will* and *desire* to sin. By dying in a *settled opposition* to God, they cast themselves into a *necessity* of continuing in an *eternal aversion* from him.—But some are of an opinion that this punishment shall have *an end,* this is as likely as that the glory of the righteous shall have an end, for the same word is used to express the duration of the *punishment, (kolasin aionion)* as is used to express the duration of the state of glory. *(zoen aionion)* I have seen the best things that have been written in favor of the final redemption of damned spirits; but I never saw an answer to the argument against that doctrine drawn from this verse, but what sound learning and criticism should be ashamed to acknowledge. The original word *(aei on)* is certainly to be taken here in its proper grammatical sense *(aiei on) continued being,* NEVER ENDING." (See Clarke's Commentary.)

Dr. Huntington, though himself a believer in universalism, viewed this subject in the same light. He says, " Does the bible plainly say that sinners of mankind shall be damned to *interminable punishment?* it certainly does; as plainly as language can express, or any man, or even God himself can speak. It is quite strange to me, that some, who believe that all mankind shall in the end

be saved, will trifle with a few words, and most of all with the original word and its derivatives translated *forever, &c.* (AI ON) All the learned know that this word in the Greek, signifies an *age, a long period, or interminable duration,* according as the connected sense requires. They therefore who would deny that the endless damnation of sinners is fully asserted in the word of God, are unfair in their reasoning and criticism." (See Calvinism Improved pp. 47, 48.)

We have now given the opinion of a *Methodist,* a *Calvinist* & an *Universalist,* on this subject, whose testimony perfectly agrees as to the strength of the terms used to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. What remains we must reserve for another number.

No. V.—*Direct evidence, &c.—continued.*

III. "*Those passages which express the duration of future punishment by implication, or by forms of speech which imply the doctrine in question:*

"The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost *shall not be forgiven unto men,* neither in this world, neither in the world to come. He hath *never forgiveness;* but is in danger of eternal damnation. *It is impossible to renew them again unto repentance.* If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins but a fearful looking for of judgment, which shall devour the adversaries. What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose himself or be cast away? Wo unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed; *it had been good* for that man *if he had not been born. Their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched.** Between us & you there is a great gulph fixed; so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot, neither *can they pass* to us who would come from thence. He that believeth not the son shall *not see life,* but the wrath of God *abideth on him.* I go my way and ye shall seek me, and shall *die in your sins;* whither I

*Several times repeated in a few verses.

go *ye cannot come.* Whose *end is destruction.* He that showeth no mercy shall have *judgment without mercy.*"*

On the above passages observe, "If there be some that never will be forgiven, there are some that never will be saved; for forgiveness is an essential branch of salvation. If there were any uncertainty with regard to the word *eternal*, in this instance, the meaning would still be fixed by the other branch of the sentence *they never shall be forgiven.* It is equal to John x, 28. *I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish.* If there were any uncertainty as to the meaning of the word *eternal* in this latter passage, yet the other branch of the passage would settle it; for that must be *endless life* which is opposed to their *ever perishing;* so that must be *endless damnation* which is opposed to their *never being forgiven.* If repentence be absolutely necessary to forgiveness, and there be some whom it is impossible to renew again unto repentence, there are some to whom salvation is *impossible. If there be no more sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking for of Judgment,* this is the same, as the sacrifice already offered, being of no saving effect; for if it were otherwise the language would not contain any peculiar threatening against the wilful sinner, as it would be no more than might be said to any sinner, nor would a *fearful looking for of judgment* be his certain doom. If the souls of some men will be *lost* or *cast away,* they cannot all be saved; for these two things are opposite. A man may be lost in a desert, and yet saved in fact; or he may *suffer* loss, and yet himself be saved; but he cannot be lost, so as to be *cast away,* and yet finally saved; for these are perfect contrarieties. Whatever may be the precise idea of the *worm* and the *fire,*‡ there can be no

*Mat. xii, 31 32. Mark iii, 29. Heb vi, 6. x, 26 27. Luke ix, 25. Mat. xxvi, 24. Mark ix, 43,—48. Luke xvi. 26 John iii, 36, viii, 21. Phil iii, 19, James ii, 13.

‡"These expressions," says Dr. Macknight "seem to be borrowed from Isa. lxvi, 24. in which passage the prophet is describing the miserable end of hardened sinners, by a similitude taken from the behaviour of conquerors, who, after having gained the battle, and beaten the enemy out of the field, go forth to view the slain. Thus, at the last day, the devil, with all his adherents, being finally and completely vanquished, the saints

doubt of their expressing the punishment of the wicked; and its being declared of the one that it *dieth not* and of the other that *it is not quenched* is the same as their being declared to be *endless*. It can be said of no man on the principle of universal salvation, that *it were good for him not to have been born*, as whatever he might endure for a season, an eternal weight of glory would infinitely outweigh it. An *impassable gulph* between the blessed & the accursed equally militates against the recovery of the one as the relapse of the other. If some shall *not see life* but the wrath of God abideth on them, if those who die in their sins shall not come where Jesus is, if their *end* be destruction, and their portion *judgment without mercy*, there must be some who will not be finally saved.

"IV. *Those passages which imply that a change of heart, and a preparation for heaven are confined to the present life.*

'Seek ye the Lord *while he may be found; call upon him while he is near*, let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.—Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded, I also will laugh at your calamity and mock when your fear cometh. When your fear cometh as desolation, & your destruction cometh as a whirlwind;

---

shall go forth to view them, doomed by the just judgment of God to *eternal death*. And this their punishment is represented by two metaphors, drawn from the different ways of burying the dead in use among the Jews. Bodies of men, interred in the earth, are eaten up of worms, which dieth when their food faileth; and those that are burned, are consumed in the fire which extinguishes itself when there is no more fuel added to feed it.—But it shall not be so with the wicked; *their worm shall not die and their fire is not quenched*. These metaphors, therefore, as they are used by our Lord, and by the prophet Isaiah, paint the eternal punishments of the damned in strong & lively colors."—"By 'the worm that dieth not' may be denoted the continual torture of an accusing conscience, and the misery naturally arising from the evil dispositions of pride, self will, desire, malice, envy, shame, sorrow, despair, and by the *fire*, &c. the positive punishment inflicted by God."—Benson.

when distress & anguish cometh upon you, then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early but shall not find me.—Then said one unto him, Lord are there few that shall be saved? And he said unto him, strive to enter in at the straight gate: for many I say unto you will seek to enter in and shall not be able. When *once* the master of the house hath risen up and shut to the door and ye begin to stand without and to knock at the door, saying Lord, Lord, open unto us: he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence you are —Depart from me ye workers of iniquity—there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—While ye have the light believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.—While they (the foolish virgins) went to buy, the bridegroom came: and they that were *ready* went in with him to the marriage, *and the door was shut.*—We beseech you, that ye receive not the grace of God in vain—Behold *now* is the accepted time, *now* is the day of salvation—to day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.—Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God—lest there be any fornicator or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know that afterwards, when he would have inherited the blessing he was rejected: for he *found no place of repentance though he sought it carefully with tears.*—He that is *unjust* let him be *unjust still;* and he that is *filthy* let him be *filthy still;* and he that is righteous let him be righteous still; and he that is holy let him be holy still.*

"According to these scriptures there will be no successful calling upon the Lord after a certain period; and consequently no salvation.—Whether there be few that shall ultimately be saved, our Lord does not here inform us; but he assures us that there will be many who will *not* be *saved*, or which is the same thing, who will not be able to enter in at the straight gate. None it is plainly intimated will be able to enter there who have not agonized here. There will be no believing unto salvation but *while we have the light;* nor any admission into the kingdom unless we be *ready at the coming of the Lord.*—

*Isa. lv. 6, 7. Prov. i. 23, 38. Luke xiii. 24, 29. John xii. 36. Mat. xxv. 5, 13. 2 Cor. vi. 1, 2. Heb. iii, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17. Rev. xxii. 11.

The present is *the accepted time—the day of salvation*, or the season for sinners to be saved. If we continue to harden our hearts through life, he will swear in his wrath that we *shall not enter his rest*. If *we turn away from him who speaketh from heaven*, it will be equally impossible for us to obtain the blessing, as it was for Esau who had sold his birthright. Finally, beyond a certain period there shall be no more change of character but every one will have received that impression which shall remain forever, whether he be *just* or *unjust*, *filthy* or *holy!!!*"

We have now completed what we intended to advance in favor of endless punishment. From the whole of which it appears, that there is a *contrast*, kept up in the scriptures between the final states of the *righteous* & the *wicked*: and as the happiness of the one is *endless*, the misery of the other must be *endless*, or the scriptures involve absurdity! It also appears that the strength of the terms used in relation to the punishment of the wicked authorises the conclusion that it will be *endless!* It likewise appears that the doctrine above asserted is *implied* in various passages, which are *totally inconsistent* with the idea of *universal salvation!* and finally, that the necessary qualifications for a state of glory and happiness, can only be obtained within a *certain period*, over which men may pass, and so never obtain them!—The natural and necessary consequence of the whole is, that *some will be finally impenitent* and that *such shall receive endless punishment!!!*

UNIVERSAL SALVATION CONSIDERED, &c.

PART II.

Examiner Observed:

A REJOINDER TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER'S "REPLY" TO THE FOREGOING.

No. I.—*Wherein it is considered, whether salvation implies deliverance from the punishment due to sin.*

We have read and attentively considered what the editor has written in "reply" to our numbers. And though we are ready to reciprocate an acknowledgement of his candor, in the general; we are not convinced by his arguments. Believing it possible to expose their fallacy, and sustain the ground we have taken, we crave his patience, and that of his readers, while we prosecute a review of the whole.

We shall *first* consider what our editor has written in reply to our observations upon the *nature of salvation.*

And we are fairly "at issue" it seems, upon this question, is there any *salvation* from the *punishment due to sin?* It appeared to us that the writer we were examining in attempting to prove the negative of this question confounded the ideas of *incurring* and *actually suffering* the penalty of the divine law. But as our editor explains his meaning, it is "that if the penalty of the divine law is incurred, and that penalty is endless death, it surely will be inflicted." (Vol. 1. p. 128.) We have no material objection to accepting his explanation, and if the princi-

ple as explained be true, it is capable of distinct proof; but whether he has offered any convincing evidence on the subject we shall see hereafter. In explaining what we considered the meaning of those passages which speak of our being rewarded according to our works we remarked that it was not "being punished as we must have been without a mediator, but consisted in our being rewarded or punished, according to our having received or rejected the mediator." In reply to this our editor asks "if our being rewarded according to our works is not being punished what is it?"—(Ibid.) The gentleman certainly knew that we believed it to imply the *punishment* of the finally impenitent—and that our observation is in nowise against *punishment* in our view of it—why then does he ask this question? But he thinks "being punished according to our deeds, by no means supercedes the necessity of a mediator."—(Ibid.) But the enquiry is, whether it is any part of the work of the mediator *to save from deserved punishment*—this we shall see hereafter. He proceeds, "the force of the argument under consideration appears to preclude all punishment for sin, save for the sin of rejecting the mediator."—(Ibid.) We will explain our views of this subject a little more at length. That *all sins unrepented of*, will be punished in a future state we do not doubt. This impenitence and infidelity, is in fact, a rejecting of the remedy provided—and it will be for this reason that all the sins of the impenitent will finally stand against them—so we may properly say, it is for rejecting the mediator, that sinners will be finally punished. But he adds, "they who never heard of a mediator cannot be justly punished for rejecting him."—(Ibid) As to those who never heard of a mediator, it will doubtless "be accepted of them according to what they have, and not according to what they have not." It must be through the mediator that they are accepted on the improvement of their talent, for "none cometh to the father but by him," he is emphatically "the way." But if they abuse the light they have, the improvement of which would be accepted *through Christ*,—this is in some sense rejecting the mediator and they are justly punished in proportion to the light they have sinned against.

But "scripture supports that there is punishment for other sins as well as for this." He here introduces Heb.

ii. 23, on which he remarks, "every transgression receives a just recompense, but severer punishment awaits those who add to their other sins that of rejecting a mediator."—(Ibid.) How strangely has he misapplied this passage! The apostle is speaking of such sins under the law as had no provision of an atonement made for them, but the sinner must be cut off without remedy. And their receiving a "just recompense of reward," implies their receiving that kind of punishment which the law prescribed. Now these sins under the law, are analogous to the sin under the gospel of rejecting a mediator.—On this parallel depends the whole force of the apostle's argument; which is indeed materially in our favor, instead of being any thing against us! Some of the preceding observations are rather a digression from the subject in dispute; they have been occasioned by the editor's strictures upon an observation of ours which was merely explanatory and not designed as argument. We shall now return to the question "at issue," and shall in the first place consider what our editor has said in answer to our objections.

We thought that the writer had contradicted his main principle in his similies, but the editor says "he asserts salvation only from that punishment consequent on our remaining sinners."—(Ibid. p. 130.) But what kind of salvation would that be? on his hypothesis we were never in danger of "remaining sinners." Of course we were never in danger of the "punishment consequent upon" it—this then is a salvation from what we were never exposed to—or a salvation from nothing! Must not this salvation be peculiar to universalism? Surely we can find salvation where there is no danger, no where else but in this system!!

But the dilemma into which the writer had cast himself, the editor, for some reason, has entirely overlooked. He remarked as follows, "there is no salvation but a salvation from sin, and when we are saved from this we are saved from all punishment, all distress, and evil of every kind." On this we observed "it identifies the *time* of salvation from sin, punishment, distress, and evil of every kind. Now this goes to say that we may be saved from distress and evil of every kind, now in this life, which is contrary to fact, or that there is no present *salvation from sin* which is contrary to scripture."

(See our 1 No. p 16.) If he can put his friend in a way to escape this dilemma he will do him an essential service.

But he proceeds to make the following objection to our doctrine, "if sinners are punished endlessly for their sins committed in this world, how and when will they be punished for the sins they commit during this eternity of punishment?" (Vol. I. p. 131.) If we were to answer *we cannot tell*, it would in no wise affect our system. For the scriptures have given us no information with regard to sins committed after death.—The doctrine of eternal punishment for sins committed in this life is a matter of revelation, and as such we receive it, but as to sins committed in another state we know nothing of them. He might as well ask if the righteous are endlessly rewarded for their righteousness in this world, how and when will they be rewarded for their righteousness during that eternity of happiness? Or we might retort his argument thus: if the sinner is punished a limited time, after his transgression, when will he be punished for the sins he commits during this *limited* punishment? If it be answered, at some time still subsequent, we might then repeat the same enquiry, when is he to be punished for the sins he commits during *this time* of punishment also? and so on *ad infinitum!* But should it be said, that when he begins to receive his punishment he ceases to sin, this will apply as well to our system as to his, and as effectually relieve it from his objection as it will his from the same objection retorted.

We come next to his reply to our objection founded on the doctrine of pardon. We urged that 'the two ideas of enduring all the punishment due to sin,' and the forgiveness of sin, were totally inconsistent with each other.—To this he replies, "Observer must first prove, in order to give his arguments efficient weight, that punishment satisfies the divine law of God, and that it can be an ample substitute and satisfaction for obedience-"—(Ibid.) In answer to this we observe, if by punishment being "an ample substitute and satisfaction for obedience," be meant that it answers the same ends in every respect it is by no means necessary to prove this "in order to give our arguments efficient weight." All that is necessary for us to make out, is, that the punishment inflicted, is all that the justice of God and his law require; and this our edit-

or will not deny. Then according to any view we have of justice, the sinner is exonerated of course, on the ground of Justice; and to talk of his being pardoned would be a solecism. To us this appears so plain that it requires no argument to prove it—it commends itself to the common sense of mankind; and we can but look with astonishment at the very extraordinary effort which our *Examiner* makes to get rid of it.

He adds: "Isa. says, (chap. xl. 2.) speak ye comfortable to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins." If this passage is correctly applied, it proves too much. It proves that God punished the Jews *double* what they deserved; which would not only make God unjust, but would be contrary to the confession of Ezra. (chap. ix. 13.) which was that God had punished them *less* than their iniquities deserved! As to the above passage Bishop Lowth comparing it with xlvi. 7. Job. xlii. 10. Zach. ix. 12. (which see) translates it thus, "speak ye comforting words to Jerusalem, and declare unto her, that her warfare is fulfilled; that the expiation of her iniquity is accepted; That she shall receive at the hand of Jehovah *blessings double* to the punishment of all her sins."—Vatabulus has it "the Lord will confer upon her many *benefits* instead of the *punishment* which she might justly suffer for her sins."—Vitringa. "A double portion of his blessings."—And Dr. Clarke "Blessings double to the punishment.—This sense of the passage," says he "the words of the original will very well bear."

The gentleman is greatly offended with our third objection, that "it makes salvation depend on our own sufferings—consequently can not be of grace." Concerning the manner in which we supposed the universalist would bring forth the head stone of his spiritual building, he "suggests to Observer that it may not be commendable in him to bear false witness against his neighbor though it be done in jest." (Ibid.) We did not consider ourselves as *bearing witness* in this case. What we said was an *inference* from the doctrine opposed. If it be not fairly drawn he should have made it appear, instead of accusing us of "bearing false witness," &c.—Again he says: "he is apprised that we do not hold that punishment is reward

ded with eternal life." Nor have we so asserted.—We stated that "it makes salvation depend on our own sufferings," &c. That is, as the *grounds*. Enduring all the punishment due to sin, is the *legal grounds*, as well as the *salutary means* of salvation; and as such, cannot be regarded as an object of terror, but must indeed be *desirable*. It still appears to us that on this system, there can be no grace at all in the sinners being exonerated from punishment; and whatever may be his song, it will not be "grace!"

Before we conclude perhaps we should notice that no reply has been given to our first objection. This was founded on several passages of scripture. In these passages we found asserted "salvation from *perishing—the curse of the law—wrath*—and *condemnation*." (See 1st No. pp 16, 17.) Now as these expressions denote *punishment*, we thought they concluded fairly, in favor of *salvation from the punishment of sin*. We now resume our conclusion, and shall presume it legitimate, until it shall be shown to be otherwise.

And if our Examiner will condescend to notice it, we will trouble him with another passage and some remarks. In Ps. ciii. 10, 12, we read, "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us." In the *first* place, the Pslamist expressly asserts that they had not been "rewarded according to their iniquities." This is directly to our purpose. His views of the holiness of God, and of the turpitude of sin, were such that he saw, that if God had rewarded them according to their iniquities, they would have been utterly destroyed. In this he lays down a general principle; he speaks the language of the church in every age.—All who are divinely enlightened, have the same correct views of the dreadfully evil nature, and destructive consequences of sin. In the *second* place as a proof of his first position he adds: "as the heaven is high above the earth so great is his mercy toward them that fear him" So far was he from supposing that God's mercy required that he should "reward all according to their iniquities," that he brings it as a proof of the contrary!

And *finally* "he has seperated our sins from us." How? In the way of punishing them according to their deserts?—No, in not punishing—but mercifully forgiving them. This is the way of human salvation—but how unlike the system we oppose!—Our conclusion is, that if we are ever saved, we must be *saved from the punishment of sin*, and not *by the means*, or *in consequence of it!!!*

No. II.—*Exemplary punishment—what was the proper penalty of the original law—and whether Salvation implies deliverance from it.*

In the first place we shall notice what our editor has advanced in opposition to us on the subject of *exemplary punishment*. (See Vol. I. pp. 131, 132.) It appeared to us that *amendatory* punishment must be confined to this life—that punishment in the world to come could not be of this description—and consequently must answer some other purpose of the divine government—*this*, we thought was to operate as an *example*. But he asks "has Observer such an idea of exemplary punishment as would oblige him to infer that God acts in two characters, now as a kind parent, then as a revengeful judge." A *revengeful judge!* By no means—we do not attribute revenge to God.—As to God acting in "two characters," according to the scriptures, he now corrects, and offers salvation, he will then punish, for rejecting his gracious offers. "Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded. But ye have set at nought my counsels and would none of my reproof. I also will laugh at your calamity and mock when your fear cometh." This different kind of treatment, is suited to the different states of probation and retribution.

He farther enquires "whether exemplary punishment in a state of eternal retribution is designed to deter from sinning the ransomed in glory or the wretched in hell, or sinners on earth." To this we answer, how "punishment in a state of eternal retribution" operates as an example, or on whom, we are not concerned to show

We believe it a matter of revelation, that it will not be *amendatory* is a matter of course, this being inconsistent with its endless duration; and that it will operate as an *example* to some orders of intelligent creatures would appear extremely probable, if we had no farther revelation on the subject. But this gentleman affirms that "it cannot be of any use but to gratify a vindictive justice, or fell revenge." We would here ask, who has disclosed the secrets of eternity to him? From what data does he draw his conclusions? Does he know the situations and relations of all orders of intelligent creatures in another state? If not, with what modesty does he make this declaration?

We thought Jude 7, supported our views. And that the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah, referred to in this passage, is exemplary, he does not deny: but he must take some method to make that punishment out temporary. Hence he quotes Lam. iv. 6. "to show that the afflictions of the Jews was a severer punishment than that of Sodom, whatever that punishment might be." But the Prophet when he says "the punishment of the iniquity of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom" evidently refers to the literal destruction of the cities of the plain, and in comparing this with the wasting siege of Jerusalem seems to think it to be preferred: for saith he "it was overthrown in a moment, and no hand stayed on her." Not as though the Jews had suffered a greater punishment than the wicked inhabitants of those cities in their *eternal state*, where they were "set forth as an example!"

He insists that "the design of punishment is to reform," but does not prove that this is always the case, to our satisfaction. Nor indeed can he, till he proves that executing a criminal for a capital offence, is designed to make him a good citizen!

What he says of "the assistance of grace in a future world" is without the least support from the scriptures; the words of the Apostle which he quotes cannot be pressed into his service without the grossest perversion!!

We shall *next* consider what he has said in reply to the first part of our second number. (See pp. 138, 139.)

We defined the first stage of salvation "a deliverance from that immediate destruction which man merited by

the first transgression and restoration to a state of *gracious probation*, which afforded all the means necessary for his final happiness." "As an objection to this position" the editor "endeavors to support that whatever destruction man merited by the first transgression was implied in the denunciation of God against it, and was *actually endured*. This he does "*endeavor* to support." It is however an unsuccessful *endeavor*, as we shall presently see. He gravely asks "which told the truth God or the serpent?" & answers "certainly God." Certainly! We have nothing to object to that!

He goes on thus, "man did not die a temporal death and we have no evidence that this death was threatened." But we think he concedes before he leaves the subject, that *temporal death*, did constitute a part of the *penalty of the law*. He says, "when God arraigned our first parents for a violation of his law, he immediately proceeded to pronounce sentence upon them." Now what was that sentence? "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.' 'From that moment he became *mortal*, a dying creature,' which was to all intents and purposes a fulfilment of the threatening, so far as it related to temporal death. But how could this gentleman deny that temporal death constituted any part of the penalty of the law, and yet admit that sentence was passed upon our first parents, when the memorable words above quoted constitute the most important part of that sentence?—yea and throughout, it includes *physical evils* exclusively—there not being one word in the whole connexion, of that *spiritual death* which our first parents no doubt experienced, & which he contends for exclusive of any other. Let him consider these things attentively, and then see, whether he has skill to reconcile all the incongruities into which he has plunged himself!

He proceeds, "neither did he die an eternal death and we have no proof that this was threatened; but he died a spiritual or moral death, therefore it is certain this death was the penalty of the original law." Then if a man is reprieved from the gallows, after being under the sentence of death for murder, it is quite certain that death is not the penalty of the law that forbids murder. And because Nineva was *not* destroyed in forty days after Jo-

nah's prophecy, therefore destruction was not threatened! —This is our Examiner's logic!!!

Eternal death we conceive, differs from spiritual death, in *duration and degree*, but not in nature. In our view of the subject, spiritual death must have been perpetuated, but for the intervention of a saviour. This is obvious from the antithesis which is every where kept up between that death which is the consequence of sin, and that eternal life which is the gift of God through Christ. The Apostle says (Rom. vi. 23.) "the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." Here *death* stands opposed to *eternal life*, and must be understood of *eternal death* if we preserve the antithesis. Again, John iii. 15. "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have *eternal life*." Here *perishing* is opposed to *eternal life* and must imply eternal death. We have evidence then, both that *eternal death* is the penalty of the law, and that through Christ we are saved from it. But he says "there is no intimation that any thing was remitted that had been threatened." Now we think there is proof enough that man was not consigned to the whole of the punishment which he had merited, on the day of transgression. But as he has undertaken to prove that he was, we should be glad to see some evidence—and shall by no means yield the point on his *bare assertion* that there is no evidence to the contrary. He proceeds "it would be proper for him first to prove that what he means by 'immediate destruction,' was threatened before he assumes that there is salvation from such destruction."—Whether we prove that this destruction was threatened, or prove directly, deliverance from it, would equally bear upon the question, and we think we have done both.

But the editor's "views of a state of probation differs in some degree from Observer's. The first created pair were placed in a state of probation in the garden, and the result proved that they could not stand by their own strength." *Could not stand!* Does he mean that they were not made "sufficient to have stood" as well as "free to fall." If so where the justice of the curse pronounced upon them? Must they be punished for what they could not help? Let not such flagrant injustice be imputed to the Most High!

Again he says—" We hold that this deliverance or 'final happiness' does not depend on the result of a 'state of gracious probation' or trial given to man, but on the *immutable promise* of God." But there is no inconsistency between a state of probation and " the *immutable promise* of God"—as this promise is *conditional*. This we shall support in another place.

He continues, " Is it reasonable for us to suppose or have we any scripture to support the idea, that God after man had fallen from his first state of probation, placed his final happiness on as precarious a foundation as the result of another state of probation would be, in which there is as great a liability of failing as at the first?" To all this we answer: their being placed in another state of probation by no means involves the consequence that " there is as great a liability of failing as at the first" for though we are liable to sin, yet there is provision made for our pardon on repentance. " If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, who is the propitiation for our sins." Our salvation is not " in *jeopardy*" if we attend to the requirement of the gospel—but if we do not, there is " scripture to support the idea," that we are by no means sure of salvation!

It does indeed appear that the editor's " views of a state of probation differ in *some degree* from Observer's." They differ *so materially*, that we *assert* and he *denies, that man is in a probationary state*. He believes that the issue is *certain* and *inevitable*.—All must and will finally be saved. Nothing they *can do*, or *leave undone*, can at all endanger their salvation!—Now on this principle it appears to us that all the admonitions—exhortations—expostulations—& threatenings, of the holy scriptures, amount to a solemn nothing!—yea they are worse than absurd!

Let him prove what follows by the scriptures, and we will surrender at once—" All mankind were created in Jesus Christ, and they never were nor never will be out of the covenant of grace in which they were created."

We pass now to notice what he has said upon two of the passages which we introduced in support of our views on this subject. (See pp. 138, 139.)

He remarks upon Rom. v. 18—" The judgment whatever it was came upon all men, so they could not be deliv-

ered from it." That judgment *came upon all men*, is evident from the passage—but that the judgment was executed, so that "they could not be delivered from it" is a gratuitous assumption! This was what he undertook in the outset "to support," but how he has supported it we have just seen. It must be obvious on the slightest attention to the subject, that the "justification of life" is opposed to the "judgment to condemnation" and implies the cancelling of that "judgment." But the editor cannot admit this because it is inconsistent with his theory.—Assuming the truth of his theory, he infers that the meaning which we have put upon the passage cannot be the true one; though indeed it be the only one which can be put upon it, without violence to every correct rule of interpretation.

Again he urges, "Neither does this scripture affirm that judgment came upon all men for the offence of Adam, but through, or by his offence." What is this but a play upon words, a mere quibble?

Again he "standing as the representative of all, portended that his offspring like himself would sin!" Does he, can he seriously think this was the apostle's meaning in the passage in question? But again, "Paul in a few verses preceding the one we are endeavoring to illustrate establishes this sentiment. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, & so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,' not for that *one has sinned*." The latter clause of this passage, upon which he lays so much stress, may be rendered as in the margin, *in whom all have sinned*. In whichever way it be rendered it is evidently designed to refer the reason why "*death* came upon *all men*" to the *sin* of the "*one man*." All have sinned in Adam their representative, being in his loins—They have derived a depraved nature from him and as soon as they have become capable of moral action have actually sinned "after the similitude of his transgression."

He adds, "justification of life, means something more than Observer represents by 'initial salvation.'" It is allowed it does in many other places and in the first verse to which the editor refers. But is it any thing strange for a word to be used in different senses? And it would be easy to show that the apostle by no means confines the

term *justification* to *one* sense in this connexion, but we must not extend our observations too far.

The Editor's criticism upon Tit. ii. 4. by the help of which he arrives at the marginal reading, we shall not quarrel with.—Though it changes one circumstance in the passage, it still in our view implies the doctrine contended for. Yet the passage "literally translated" says Dr. Clarke "stands thus: *For the grace of God, that which saves hath shone forth upon all men.* And Mr. Wesley translates it: *For the saving grace of God hath appeared to all men.* On these translations our argument stands in full force!

He has bestowed no remarks upon the third passage which we quoted, 1 Tim. iv. 19. "who is *the saviour of all men*, especially of those that believe." Here the apostle plainly distinguished between *general* and *especial* salvation. If he is *especially* the saviour *of all men*, this passage must convey an incorrect idea of the subject!—The above passages we still conceive to justify the observations which we made upon them. More might be adduced; but as we have necessarily, in following our Examiner through his various ramifications, been somewhat prolix, we must dismiss this part of the subject for the present.

No. III.—*On the doctrine of* ATONEMENT.

We shall confine our observations in this number to the subject of *atonement*. We had reserved what we intended to say in reply to the editor, on this subject, for a distinct number, not supposing that we should thereby expose ourselves to a suspicion of being "insufficient to the task of refuting what" (he supposes) "the scriptures so plainly support."

In considering this subject we shall *first*, endeavor to show the absurdity of the Editor's system, and *secondly*, shall more fully explain and vindicate our views.

He proceeds, "We believe that justice demands this 'thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,' &c.

Christ came to satisfy that Justice, and fulfil the law of God by bringing every man to the requirements of it, and until this is accomplished, justice or the law of God will *not be satisfied*" (Vol. I. p. 129.) that justice demands that we should *love God with all our heart*, we do not doubt:—but if justice is fully satisfied by the sinner's subsequent obedience, it appears to us that he is *justified by the law*. And this is flatly contrary to the apostle, who says that "by the *deeds of the law* no flesh shall be *justified*." This system appears to be altogether *legal*, and to supercede the apostle's doctrine of justification *by faith through grace*. Subsequent obedience to the law *satisfies justice*. On this ground the sinner is justified.—Now if his doctrine of receiving all the punishment deserved, does not supercede *pardon & grace*, certainly *this* does! Subsequent obedience makes ample amends for past transgressions. Is enough more than the law requires, for the time being, to atone for past failures. How far short does this come of Romish *works of supererogation?*

Again he says. "He came *to fulfil the law and one jot or tittle shall not fail till all be fulfilled. He will magnify the law and make it honorable.*' But this never can be done while it is violated by those who are responsible to it, but only when it is fulfilled by the obedience of all." (p. 130.) In answer to this we observe, Christ *fulfilled the law*. 1. By his own personal obedience to it. 2. By accomplishing every thing shadowed forth in the Mosaic ritual. 3. He fulfilled in himself all those predictions of the prophets concerning the Messiah. 4. Finally, he accomplished, illustrated, and established the moral law, in its highest meaning, both by his life and doctrine.—Thus has he fulfilled the law!—And cannot the law be magnified and made honorable, but by the obedience of all? certainly it can! When is the civil law of the land *magnified* and *made honorable*—or held in the highest estimation? When it is faithfully executed, in the protection of the innocent, and the *just punishment of the guilty!* The law being *magnified and made honorable*, by no means implies "the obedience of all." But is it the work of Christ to make all men obedient, and will justice not be satisfied until he accomplishes the event? And is the demand of justice for the sinner's obedience transferred to Christ, and the sinner exonerated? Or is it made on both?

—We hope our editor will give us some further explanation of this subject, for we would be glad to see a little more clearly where the obligation rests.—On whom the demand is made.

But finally if Christ will in fact make all men obedient, *independent* of their agency, or in *violation* of it, it must be capable of proof and we invite our Examiner to the task of making it appear.

We proceed next to explain and vindicate our views of *atonement*. And we should first notice that the editor in quoting our words (p. 129) is guilty of a culpable omission, the words are "Jesus suffered the *punishment* of our sins in a qualified sense." By omitting the word *punishment* he has perverted our meaning.

He proceeds, "he must believe according to the course of his argument that justice demanded the endless punishment of sinners, and that Jesus suffered in the room of sinners and so satisfied the demand." (Ibid.) We do believe that "justice demands the endless punishment of sinners." and that Jesus Christ so "suffered in their room, and satisfied that demand" that they *may be saved if they will*. But we do by no means believe in the doctrine of *absolute imputation & substitution*:—that justice is so satisfied by the sufferings of Christ in behalf of a *part*, or the *whole*, that they must be saved unconditionally, or God be unjust!! But we believe that the sufferings and death of Christ, presented the *law—the nature of sin* and the *displeasure of God against it*, in such a light, that no imputation would lie against the righteousness of the great legislator, though he should forgive the sinner on his repentance and submission!

Our *Candid Examiner* thinks it necessary for us in order to support our system, "to prove that the demands of divine justice are opposed to divine mercy," and remarks "there is no war between the attributes of God," (p. 140.) We are far from supposing that there is "war between the attributes of God." We have shown how those attributes perfectly harmonize in the system of human redemption. God's goodness is so far from opposing such an exercise of his justice, as would secure his honor, and the best good of his creatures in general, that it absolutely requires it. And the justice of God is not opposed to the *exercise of* mercy, when it can be done in a way

consistent with the dignity of the law, and the honor of the supreme governor. Now does this system represent the attributes of God as *hostile?* If this is "war between the attributes of God" we know not what would not be.

Our 2d remark on Rom. viii, 35—36, "discloses an idea concerning satisfaction which" he desires us "to reconsider and explain more fully." The remark we need not repeat here, the reader may see it in this work p. 40. But we will proceed briefly to answer his remarks upon it. "This satisfaction does not preclude the exercise of grace in forgiveness." Certainly not. It only opens the way for its free exercise! "therefore it does not pay the debt." Not *literally*. We do not understand the atonement strictly in the light of a *pecuniary transaction!*—"It does not satisfy the demands of justice." Not indeed, so that it relinquishes its claims on the sinner's obedience!—"Forgiveness is as necessary as though Christ had not died." Yes for all those who have actually sinned?—"It is evident" says Mr. Shinn "that our Saviour did not die to supercede the necessity of pardon, by giving us a *legal* discharge from all penalties, but to open the way for mercy, to deliver all those from suffering the penalty who come boldly, (that is believingly) to a throne of grace; not to a throne of justice to sue out their liberty in the name of their surety; but that they might obtain *mercy*, and find grace to help in time of need.—The death of Christ manifested God's abhorrence of sin, as well as his love to the sinner, and justified the heavenly government in the pardon of all penitents, as well as it would have been done if all sinners in the universe had been forever damned. This was all mercy was waiting for; namely, for such an exposure of the dreadful evil of sin, and such a demonstration of God's hatred against it, as should glorify his attributes and restore the government to its native dignity & influence over his intelligent creatures. This was accomplished by our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore every moral attitude was satisfied, that a free pardon should be granted to every sinner of Adam's race that would receive the saviour for his Lord & King." Finally, the gentleman observes "this satisfaction is *only* to prevent a suspicion of his having relinquished his regard for righteousness." Well, and is it a matter of no importance to prevent such a suspicion; would there

be no blot on the divine administration—would no evil accrue to the system, if there were an evident want of 'regard for righteousness' in the supreme Legislator and Governor of the world? He speaks as though this were a matter of indifference!!! As to the case which he has stated on this page "to exemplify this doctrine" as it obviously does not exemplify it at all, we deem no remarks upon it necessary.

We shall next consider the explanation which he has given *one* of the passages which we quoted for the explanation of the Universalists. The passage is Isa. liii 5.—On it he observed, "in the verse preceding that which he has left for us to explain, we read the following: surely he hath bourn our griefs and carried our sorrows.'—Now in what sense did Christ bear our sorrows? Let the scripture decide." He then quotes Mat. viii. 16, 17, (which see) and remarks, "from this it is plain that Christ taking our infirmities and bearing our sicknesses, means delivering us from them." (p. 180.) But we are not to suppose that because the evangelist said "the words of the prophet were fulfilled," this was all, or the highest sense in which they were spoken. "Whereby was fulfilled viz. in a lower sense than primarily intended by the prophet; '*Saying himself took our infirmities*,' &c. Isa. spoke it in a more exalted sense, the evangelist here only alludes to those words as capable of this lower meaning also. Such instances are frequent in the sacred writings, and are elegancies rather than imperfections. He fulfilled these words in the highest sense, by *bearing our sins in his own body on the tree;* in a lower sense by sympathising with us in our sorrows, and healing us of the diseases which were the fruit of sin." (See Benson and Wesley on the place.)

Many more passages might be produced equally, or more hostile to his views of *atonement*, which we may bring forward on some other occasion, at present we must not enlarge.

We shall close this number by noticing an objection which he glances at, (p. 129,) It is that the sufferings of Christ, on what he supposes to be our theory, must be *unjust and cruel*. He asks, "would it satisfy the parent or his law of love to inflict *unparalleled punishment* on his first born and obedient son for the sins of the rest? No,

instead of satisfying him, it would be an aggravation of his sorrows, and also a violation of his law and justice." Answer. The editor himself believes that Christ suffered in some sort, for the guilty, namely, through "sympathy" for them, &c. Of course he cannot suppose that it is *unjust* and *cruel* for the innocent to suffer for the guilty in some sense? As to Christ's suffering "unparalleled *punishment*" we have sufficiently explained in what sense he suffered. That is, as a *sacrifice to public justice for the sin of the world.* And that he could thus suffer consistent with justice, is evident, provided, 1. That he do it by his own consent and choice. 2. That he have a right thus to dispose of himself. And 3 That the ends of the divine government be as effectually answered, as they would have been in the final punishment of the world of offenders!—Under these circumstances where is the injustice? None is done to Christ, for he suffers by his own choice.—None to the divine Legislator, or the public, for the ends of good government are secured.

No. IV.—*On the* CONDITIONS *of Salvation.*

We shall devote our remarks in this number to the subject of *conditions.* On this subject we explained our views in the third part of our 2d number, which the reader is requested to turn to and examine.

The editor, in his reply on this subject, rather than confront the plain scriptures, with the natural and necessary consequences which are drawn from them, seems for the time to yield to their force. He says, "with what is said on this point we agree. yet there may be a dispute whether all will comply,"&c.(p. 110.) Here he allows that salvation is *conditional;* for in the place to which he alludes, this was unequivocally asserted. Now how well he agrees with what we "said on this point," will be seen in the following. "Why is this new covenant established upon better promises? Because the promises are *not conditional* like the promises of that covenant which was done away. If the blessings of the new cove-

nant are *conditional* how is it established upon better promises?" (p. 156.) If salvation is *conditional* as he first concedes, and the *promises* of the new covenant *are not conditional*, as he now asserts, where is consistency? If *the editor* can settle this difference with *himself*, we have no objections!

"Whether all will comply," is another enquiry. To this we shall now attend. "All will finally be brought to repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ," this "receives very strong support from what Observer has communicated under his second general head, 'Here he not only made it consistent, &c. for men to be saved on certain conditions, but provided efficient means, by giving his spirit to accomplish the work.'" (Ibid.) But he is very much mistaken as to deriving any support from what we have said. We said nothing about the spirit's *performing conditions* for the sinner, or *irresistably forcing* him to perform them. The work of the spirit is to convince, sanctify, &c. But it is possible for the sinner so to "*resist the Holy Ghost*," as not to be sanctified by his influence!

Again, "With regard to these conditions being antecedent to the possession of the benefit, we would state that the conditions do not particularly differ from the benefit itself." (Ibid.) Not indeed! And is this according to the common sense of mankind? That the terms upon which a benefit is suspended "do not particularly differ from the benefit itself?" A laboring man on the condition of working hard a day, receives a bushel of grain. Now it appears to us that the man would discover a *particular* difference between the *condition* and the *benefit* itself.

But perhaps he will make it out, "as far as a person repents by breaking off his sins." &c. "so far he is saved." (Ibid.) But salvation may be the immediate consequence of repentance, and still be "*particularly* different" from it! Again, "If it is held forth that holiness is a condition of salvation, it is also held forth that holiness is salvation." (Ibid.) If our Examiner can find any place in the Bible where holiness is "set forth," as the condition of salvation, and as salvation itself, in the same sense, *his singular* notions will derive some support from *such a place*. We should hardly have said so much upon *some of these crude effusions*, but that he has thought to

of so much importance to his theory, as to repeat them! (In p. 155.)

We shall next consider some additional remarks which he has made, on resuming this subject. (See pp. 155, 156.)

He says, "what are generally called the important conditions of salvation, are performed by God." Does he believe that those conditions which we have shown to be required of men, (p. 21.) are *unimportant?* If not, they must be "performed by God." And if the conditions of *repentance* and *faith* are performed by God, would it not be as preposterous to require them of man, as to require him to do any other of *God's peculiar* works? Can any reason be given why he is to be damned for not doing God's work? If so we would be obliged to this gentleman to favor us with it; for we confess that we cannot conceive of any! Again, he says "our salvation from beginning to end is all of God." If he intends by this to assert that the conditions are *all* performed by God, we dissent!

We will now notice the scriptures which he alleges in support of his doctrine,"— unto you first God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." (Acts iii. 25, 26.) Upon this passage he remarks those who contend for conditions to be performed by man, support that we must of ourselves turn from our iniquities." Whoever holds that "we must *of ourselves*," (by which we suppose is meant without the help of God) "turn from our iniquities" this is by no means our sentiment. And this the editor must very well have known. After what we had written on the influences and offices of the spirit, he could not be mistaken as to our views of this subject. He continues "Peter does not say, God sent Jesus to bless you if you will turn from your iniquities, but God sent him to bless you by turning every one of you from his iniquities."— The passage by no means necessarily implies that Jesus will *turn us from our iniquities.* But without the least violation of the language, the words may be paraphrased thus, "God sent his son to bless you," with the forgiveness of sin, on conditions of your "turning every one of you from his iniquities," this meaning accords perfectly with the apostle's language in the 19th verse, "*Repent ye therefore,* and be converted that your *sins may be blot*

ted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the Lord." Here, all that we contend for is expressed.

But if it be necessary more fully to prove that we have something to do in *turning to God*, we will produce a *few* passages of the *many*, which might be quoted. "*Turn ye* unto him, from whom the children of Israel have revolted —If *they* will hearken, and *turn every man from his evil way*:—But if the *wicked* will *turn from all his sins* that he hath committed, and keep my statutes &c.—*Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways*, for why will ye die—But showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that *they should repent and turn to God* and do *works meet for repentance—Repent ye*, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.,, (Isa. xxxi. 6. Jer. xxvi. 3. Ezek. xviii. 21.—xxxiii. 11. Acts xxvi. 20. Mat. iii. 2.) Were we to quote all the passages which go to prove directly or indirectly, that the co-operation of our agency is necessary in our salvation, we should transcribe a great part of the Bible. That God is sometimes said to *turn men to him* we will admit. But we are to understand by this that he gives them *power*,—furnishes them with *motives—draws them by his spirit—calls* and *admonishes* them, to *turn from their sins to himself*. And not that he turns them *irresistably*. This would be to destroy the agency of man, and consequently the morality of his actions.

Again, "But now hath he,' Jesus 'obtained a more excellent ministry by how much he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises: why is the new covenant 'established upon better promises? because the promises are not conditional," &c. In answer to this we observe, 1. This reason is not founded in fact. We trust that we have made appear that there are *conditions* in the *new*, or *gospel covenant*, and indeed he has once acknowledged it. (in p. 140.) 2. A much more consistent, and the *true* reason is, that it gives *better* terms.—It accepts of penitence and faith instead of *perfect* & *unsinning* obedience. It promises *better* things: —The old covenant promised *earthly* things, the new, *heavenly*.

But finally he gives us his favorite passage, "Behold the days come saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of

Judah, 'I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."—"Israel and Judah stand here for the true people or church of God," Benson. (se Gal. vii. 16.) And *these*, it is taken for granted, had fulfilled, and would continue to fulfil the *conditions*. But he says "the faithfulness of God is engaged in the performance of the new covenant." His part of it only! "I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people,"—"these are the two grand conditions by which the parties in this covenant are bound. 1. 'I will be your God.' As the object of religious adoration to any man, is that being from whom he expects light, direction, defence, support and happiness; so, God, promises in effect, to give them all these great and good things. 2. 'Ye shall be my people,' implies that they should give God their whole hearts, serve him with all their light and strength, and have no other object of worship and dependance but himself. Any of these *conditions* broken, the covenant is rendered null and void, and the other party absolved from his engagement." Dr. Clarke. So the passage upon which so much stress is laid is nothing against conditions. Though they are not so clearly expressed, they are certainly implied!

He goes on to remark "It is a pity that God's will is so shackled with conditions and contingencies, that it never can be accomplished." Answer. *Contingencies*, is a word which we have not used; and as to *conditions*, it never was the will of God to *save all*, without them! Again he says: "We will use a better term than violate, and say that God may *change* the nature of man in order to save him." Answer. But he must change it in a way not to *violate* it! He proceeds, "Paul said, 'We look for the Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, — according to the working, whereof he is able to subdue all things to himself.'" Answer. Christ *changing our vile body*, or *subduing all things*, does not imply the *conversion of all men*, *much less* does it imply that salvation is *unconditional!* This passage refers to the resurrection, and has nothing to do with the subject *under consideration*!

He thinks if "those who are not in a situation to understand the import of conditions, may be saved uncondi-

tionally, it would not be improper to wish that there never had been, nor never would be any but those incapable of understanding the import, and performing those conditions." He may wish that man had been made different from what the God of infinite wisdom saw fit to make him. But perhaps the apostle's reproof would not be misapplied in that case. "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that *repliest against God*—shall the *thing formed* say unto him that *formed it, why hast thou made me thus?*"

He continues, "shall we conclude that God by raising up prophets, and preachers to instruct us in the way of salvation, and by giving us powers of intellect to understand it, will effect the endless damnation of many?" It is the abuse of these mercies which effects "the endless damnation of" *any*, it is by no means to be laid to God's charge!

He proceeds, "and will the works of his goodness eventuate in greater evil than good?" That "the works of God's goodness" are so abused as to "eventuate in evil," is a fact which comes under every day's observation. How often are those blessings which were designed to serve the purposes of human happiness, made the instruments of the greatest human misery? And this misery is in general, proportionate to the amount of mercies abused!—And may not sinners "turn the grace of God into lasciviousness,—treasure up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath," by rejecting the council of God against themselves;" and so the word which was designed for their *salvation*, be "a saviour of death unto death" unto them? Certainly all this is plain, from the word of God! But as to "the work of God's goodness eventuating in *greater* evil than good," if it be intended to apply *universally*, it is a consequence which we disclaim, and which never can fairly be drawn from any thing we have advanced. But if it be intended to apply *only* to the individual person who abuses *goodness*, then it may be acknowledged that the *evil* which flows from the *abuse of these mercies* is *greater* than the *good* which he receives, though not greater than the good which he *would have received*, by a faithful improvement of it.

No. V.—*Arguments and Scriptures supposed to support universal salvation* CONSIDERED.

In our third number, Part 1, we gave an answer to the arguments, and an explanation of the passages of scripture, which were produced by the writer we were reviewing, in support of his theory. These constituting the main bulwarks of universalism, we were far from expecting they would be given up without a struggle. But to what purpose the editor has exerted himself in their defence we shall now proceed to enquire.

The first argument in favor of the doctrine we oppose which we shall now consider is drawn from the *will of God.*—After partially introducing our answer to this argument, he gives us a *new* (though not an *improved*) edition of it, thus: "God has said 'my council shall stand and I will do all my pleasure'. Paul informs us that God 'having made known unto us the mystery of his *will* according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth even in him,' —Here is the will of God in as positive terms as language can render it." (P. 155.) To this we answer, 1. That God's *council will stand'* and that he will do all his pleasure,' we do not doubt. But the question is whether it is *according to his council and good pleasure,* to save all men absolutely, independent of, or in opposition to, their own free choice. 2. As to the passage taken from Ephesians, (Chap. 1. 10.) several things must be made out before it can suit his purpose. 1. That the dispensation of the fulness of time, refers to the time of the restoration. 2. That the terms *all things,* &c. embrace *every individual of the whole human family.* And indeed *all the fallen angels.* And in that case the Apostle ought to have added to 'things in heaven, and things in earth,' *things* also in *hell!* And 3. That being gathered in Christ, in this place, refers to final and eternal salvation!! Until he does this, however *positive* the language may be, it does not serve his cause at all.

In our answer we remarked, that "what the apostle *intends by" the* words "God will have all men to be saved" *can be nothing* else than his disposition to save sin-

ners and make them happy, in a way consistent with their *free agency.*" To this he proposes a number of objections. "Why did a God of infinite wisdom & knowledge delegate to sinners a free agency which he must have known would frustrate his disposition or will." (Ibid.) We might ask the same question in relation to moral evil, which as much *frustrates the will of God*, as the final damnation of the sinner. This question he is as much concerned to answer as we are, and when he answers it, he will have a complete and satisfactory answer to the one which he proposes. He proceeds, "the idea that God committed to men a *free agency* omnipotent over his purpose, will and disposition, is in our view preposterous in the extreme." (Ibid.) Answer. 1. God has no "*purpose*" to save men but in a way consistent with their nature as moral agents. 2. That God could save all men; that is, that he possesses power adequate to that, or any other object, we do not question. But will our Examiner put God upon doing every thing that he has power to do, without any regard to moral fitness? Would not this be "preposterous in the extreme?" He farther says "that God has a disposition for all men to be saved supposes that he is, and ever will be a disappointed being." (Ibid.) By no means. Unless he has a disposition to save them, *absolutely and unconditionally*. He has never desired the salvation of any, but in compliance with the terms upon which this salvation is suspended.

Our editor adds, "It is not denied but that men are moral agents, but this agency we hold is limited, and can never destroy the purposes of God in the salvation of our race." (Ibid.) We beg leave to answer this, in the words of an able and ingenious writer. (See *the doctrine of universal restoration examined and refuted* by D. Isaac, p. 21.) "In all the divine dispensations in relation to man, God has an eye to his free agency, and will not destroy it. Misery entered with the abuse of liberty;—and the *possibility* of the abuse of it being continued, militates against the *certainty* of the restoration in question; for to say that a man endowed with the liberty to sin, must *necessarily* be virtuous, is a contradiction in terms."

He finally comes to our argument "Observer has drawn a strange inference from the position that God's will must be done. Thus he writes 'the will of God c

cerning sinners must be done.' Well it is the will of God that they should not sin. Therefore according to our writer's logic there is no such thing in the universe as sin.' This is drawing conclusions at random. What is the will of God concerning sinners? that they should be saved from their sins and be made happy. What conclusion would naturally be drawn from this. That there is no such thing in the universe as sin?" (Ibid.) The gentleman has certainly made a very singular shift, to evade a plain and necessary conclusion, the force of which he plainly saw would prostrate his beloved argument. Our answer stands thus "the will of God concerning sinners must be done." 'It is the will of God that they should not sin.—Therefore, there is no such thing in the universe as sin.' The will of God, against the existence of moral evil we thought as obviously asserted as against final misery. We therefore thought the conclusion that there is no such thing in existence as sin, as legitimate as the conclusion, that all will be saved. And as this argument concludes against the fact of the introduction, & continuance to the present, of moral evil, it must be false. Now how has he answered this argument? He has changed the premises; instead of "it is the will of God that his creatures should not sin," he has it, it is the will of God "that they should be saved from their sins;" and then asks "what conclusion would naturally be drawn from this? That there is no such thing in the universe as sin? &c. This he supposes would be "drawing conclusions at random." But does this gentleman himself *act* "at random" when he violently forces our conclusion from our premises, and tacks it on to his own in order to fault our logic, or make our argument inconclusive?—Or does he discover a studied design to save himself the task of looking our arguments in the face!—We ask no further favors of him, than to meet us on the ground of fair argumentation. If upon this ground he will show that our answer to this *formidable* argument of the universalists, is not conclusive, we pledge ourselves to find out some other method to answer it, or submit to its force!!

He proceeds "there is sin and it is contrary to the will of Jehovah." (Ibid.) This is a *grand concession* indeed! *Sin is in existence "contrary to the will of Jehovah." In this case then, to use his own language the will of God is*

"*frustrated.*" Let him now face about, and answer his own arguments; for they all go as directly against this concession of his, as they do against our doctrine of eternal punishment!

Again he says "Universalists do not believe that the ultimate will or purpose of God concerning sinners is already done while they are sinners but it must in due time be done in their deliverance from sin." (Ibid.) But if the will of God is not now done, how does he know that it will be ultimately? If it may be thwarted for a moment, may it not be for an age, yea to eternity?

Finally he adds, "does it conseqently follow that because God wills the salvation of sinners and because that will, will finally be done that *sin of every kind is according to* the will of Jehovah?" (Ibid.) It consequently follows that if *God's will is done in every thing then sin of every kind* is according to the *will of Jehovah.* This was the manner in which this part of our argument was stated. And it *consequently follows* that the cause which requires that the arguments of an opponent should be *perverted, & misstated,* before they can be answered, must be a desperate cause!—And it consequently follows, from the whole that the "conclusion" drawn "at random" as it was, is like the bow drawn at a venture—it smote Ahab between the joints of the harness!!!

We come now to consider what he has said on the scripture evidence. (See pp. 156. 157.) He thinks that the general remarks which we made upon the passages under consideration, "recall the objections against universal salvation contained in our previous remarks." But how he can in any consistency think so we cannot perceive.—Does the phrase "general conversion of the nations which is yet to take place" make any thing in favor of universalism? And these are the words it is presumed upon which he predicates his remark. And does this go to say that all who have *died unconverted* will be saved? Does it go to say that *every individual* of those nations which should *generally* be converted, will be converted and saved? Especially when we stated in the very next sentence, *that general terms,* were not always to be taken in an *absolute* sense. We have indeed conceded nothing at all.

The rule he lays down for understanding the extent of these "general terms *all flesh, all nations*," &c. is as follows. "If there is positive and unequivocal testimony that a part of mankind will be endlessly miserable, then these general terms are limited in their signification; but if there are not, & there are unequivocal scriptures to establish universal salvation, then these *general terms* corroborate the same doctrine." To this rule we do not object, & shall pass to examine the "*unequivocal scriptures*" which he brings forward on his side of the question. He introduces them with the remark, that "*every* is an unequivocal term," But if he will carefully examine, he will find that even this term must be sometimes limited. (See Col. i. 23. ii. Cor. ii. 14. Mat. ix. 35. Rev. vi 15.)

The first passage he produces is "Jesus tasted death for every man." On this passage there will be no dispute between us, as to its *extent*. The only thing in dispute will be whether all for whom Christ died will finally be saved.*

The next is Isa. xlv. 23. "unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." We suppose that the editor entertains Mr. Winchester's opinion upon this text "that every knee shall bow to him as their Lord, and swear allegiance and fealty to his righteous and just government. (See Lectures, Vol. II. P. 237.) What then couldthe prophet mean by adding, "& all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." Especially since (as the author just quoted says,) "God always requires the most excellent things to be offered to him, and in the most free and willing manner and as he requires the whole heart, mind and strength to be fully dedicated to him, it is not likely that he will accept of a nominal, unwilling and forced subjection and praise." (Ibid p. 139) Now to be *incensed* is to be *enkindled to rage—inflamed with anger*—to be *provoked and exasperated*. And can

*Some writers take different ground.—Mr. M'Calla says:—"*Christ saves all for whom he dies*"—Upon this principle, we can see no possibility of his consistently avoiding the consequence, that *all men will be saved*—for that *Christ died for all men without exceptions*, is in our view, as unequivocally asserted in the scriptures, as any truth which they contain!

any one see how these passions exerted against God, can be consistent with the act of dedicating to him "the most excellent things" yea, "all the heart, mind & strength—in a most free and willing manner." If so they can reconcile the most palpable contradictions—and reconcile Mr. Winchester's theory with the word of God!

"But the Apostle Paul alludes to this passage in Rom. xiv. 10, 11, 12. Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11. Instead of infering from it an universal restoration, he quotes it in the former passage, as proving an universal Judgment. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written: As I live, saith the Lord every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11. must be interpreted as referring to the same event, to make the apostle a consistent writer." (See Mr. Isaac, pp. 86, 87.)

Finally, "John heard every creature in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea, ascribing blessing, and honor, and glory, and power unto God, & unto the Lamb, forever and ever." "These words" says Dr. Chauncey (See salvation of all men, pp. 238, 239.) "evidently look forward to the completion of the scheme of God with reference to mankind; bringing in the sinless intelligence above as uniting with the whole race of Adam, in giving the glory of their restitution to God."—To which an able antagonist replies "If our author had first proved a state of correction, or discipline, for the 'cure of the patients themselves' after the last judgment, and before the 'completion of the scheme of God with regard to all mankind,' this text would have gone farther towards proving the final restoration of all things; but even then he must have proved that this text looks forward to that period."

The connections plainly show that it does not, but that it is accomplished in time, and probably had its fulfilment long since. "But should we understand by *every creature*, only every one of the distinctive characters of holy, or righteous, we are sure that the scriptures will bear us out. For then the phrase *every creature*, is a strong hyperbole, a figure frequently used in the sacred writings. *Of this we will* give only two instances out of many. The *first is of the* wicked in Rev. vi, 15. 16, 17. (which see

Notwithstanding the description in this place is so very explicit and full, yet we are sure that the righteous are not included in it. The *second* is a joyous event only as it respects God's people the Jews, viz: the destruction of old Babylon. '*The heavens and the earth, & all that is therein,* shall sing for Babylon; for the spoilers come unto her from the north saith the Lord.' Jer li, 48.—Notwithstanding *all in heaven and earth* are said to *sing* on this occasion; yet the thousands of Chaldea, with her commercial connections, (See Rev. xviii. 9, 19.) and all those who were in their graves, at least that part of them who died in their sins, were necessarily excluded from participating in this joyful event. *Lastly.* It may be observed that St. John does not mention *hell* among the places which contribute to the general chorus; which is an omission we connot account for, if he really meant that they were redeemed from that place of torment. (Universal Salvation Refuted, pp. 61, 62.)

Thus we see that these "*unequivocal scriptures,*" which our editor alleges in support of "universal salvation," most certainly, do not "establish" that doctrine. That for *very good reasons,* we believe them perfectly consistent with the doctrine of eternal punishment!

No. VI.—*The argument in favor of eternal punishment founded upon contrast,* DEFENDED.

We come at length to the defence of the arguments advanced in favor of eternal punishment.

The first argument is founded upon a class of passages which are supposed to describe the *future* and *final* states of men in *contrast.* One observation which was designed to show that these passages refer to the *final states of men,* is that "the state of the righteous which is all along opposed to that of the wicked is allowed to be final." This the editor says is not "allowed," and "that many of these passages refer to a future state is a disputed position." (*Vol. I. p.* 169.) But he does not say how many of these passages are wrongly applied. Out of twenty

he has attempted to explain only *three*—and has noticed our remarks* upon three or four more:—The remainder stand uneffected: And were we to give up those which he has attempted to explain, what remains would be amply sufficient for our purpose. We are not however inclined to give them up, but shall proceed to defend their proper meaning, and to show that the explanation which the editor gives of them is altogether erroneous.

He confines himself principally to the parable of the *wheat and the tares*—of *the sower*—*and of the net cast into the sea.* (Mat. xiii. 30. 41. 42. 43, 48, 49, 50.)

Upon these passages no particular remark was made: But the editor says we support "the common opinion, that the kingdom brought to view in these places, is a state of glory and felicity in a future spiritual world." (P. 164.) And after referring to the 41 verse 'they shall gather out of his kingdom all things which do offend and them which do iniquity' he asks "does the kingdom here mean the final state of the righteous, i. e. Heaven above?" & with great sagacity concludes. "Then all things that offend and them which do iniquity must first go there before they can be gathered out." (Ibid.) The gentleman has here stormed a citadel, with nothing to oppose him, but the phantoms of his own imagination. For this "opinion—common" as it is, we can assure him, is to us, entirely novel:—we never heard of it till now—and do by no means "support" any such thing!

"The kingdom of their Father" in the 23d verse, we suppose does indeed refer to "Heaven above"—But "His kingdom" in the passage upon which he remarks, we shall "support" refers to *the visible church*—Here, in the *militant church*, are some *tares* mixed with the *wheat*—some *bad* with the *good*:—and human wisdom cannot always discriminate between them. And when a separation would endanger the *wheat*, or the truly pious, they

*These *remarks*, it will be recollected are taken from Mr. Fuller.—But as we hold ourselves responsible for every thing which we have quoted from others, with approbation, we are *not in this review* particular to distinguish between such matter *and that which is original*: after having given the authors credit *we consider* the sentiments, in some sense, as our own.

must "grow together till the harvest," when infinite wisdom will make a just distinction between them.

He proceeds: "If the end of the world means the end of time, and severing the wicked from among the just means a separation which it is said will take place at a day of general judgment, at the close of time, then the good and the bad of all generations who have died, and who will die previous to that time, must remain together in the same place or state till that period." (Ibid.) Their *growing together* cannot strictly apply to their state after death.—As for those who shall have died before the end of the world, their respective states are *then*, (at death) unalterably fixed. As to their happiness or misery, it is to them as certain as though the judgment were already passed.—And the two characters will by no means *remain together* after death—For the rich man was in *Hell*, and Lazarus in *Abraham's bosom*, and there *was an impassable gulph between them*!* (See Luke xvi, 19, 31. inclusive.)

---

*There is a very striking resemblance between many of the circumstances in our Lord's account of the rich man and Lazarus, and the account which *Josephus* gives of the states of the just and unjust in HADES:—"In this region" says he "there is a certain place set apart, as a *lake of unquenchable fire:* whereinto we suppose no one hath hitherto been cast, but it is prepared for a day afore determined by God, in which one righteous sentence shall deservedly be passed upon all men; when the unjust, and those that have been disobedient to God, shall be adjudged to this *everlasting punishment;*—while the just shall obtain an incorruptible and never-fading kingdom.—These are now indeed in hades, but not in the same place where the unjust are confined.

"For there is one decent into this region, at whose gate we believe there stands an arch-angel with an host; which gate, where those pass through that are conducted down by the angels appointed over souls, they do not go the same way, but the just are guided to the right hand—This place we call the *bosom of Abraham.*

"But as to the unjust, they are dragged by force to the left hand by the angels aloted for punishment—they see the place (or choir) of the Fathers and of the just—for a *chaas deep and large is fixed between them:* insomuch that a just man that *hath compassion* upon them *cannot* be admitted, nor can one that be *unjust if he were bold* enough to attempt it, pass over it."—

He next enquires "what period of time is meant by the end of the world." To determine this point he refers to the 24th chap. of Mat. And *assuming* that our Lord's prophecy contained in that chapter, refers *only* to the destruction of Jerusalem, he *presumes* that the phrase under consideration also refers *only* to that event. But this "assumed position" we shall by no means concede to him.

We will now carefully consider the evidence upon which he relies, as limiting this prophecy to the destruction of Jerusalem.

His main argument is founded upon the 34th verse:—"This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled"—It is allowed that '*these things*' were in *some sense fulfilled* in the destruction of Jerusalem, but this does not prove but that they are still to be fulfilled, in a more *strict* & *literal* sense, on *the final judgment*.—Prophecies are often said to be *fulfilled*, in certain events, when they are only fulfilled in an *accommodated* sense, in those events.

But were we to admit that a *strict* and *literal* fulfilment is here intended, we may still contend that the word *generation* does not necessarily refer to the lives of the individual persons then in being. This word is rendered from the greek word *genea* which signifies *a stock, a race or progeny*. (See Hedericus' and Parkhurst's Lexicons.) Agreeably to this sense of the word, Dr. Clarke explains the passage under consideration. 'He *genea aute this race*; i. e. the *jews* shall not cease from being a *distinct people*, till all the councils of God relative to *them*, and the *gentiles*, be fulfilled.' (See Clarkes Commentary.)

(See JOSEPHUS' DISCOURSE *to the Greeks concerning Hades*.) Josephus here gives us the opinions of the Jews upon the states of the righteous and the wicked after death—and if indeed it is so erroneous as the Univeralists suppose, it is marvelous that our Lord not only did not censure it, with other Jewish errors, but gave his sanction to the most material circumstances of it: even allowing what he says in the place above referred to, to be a *parable*;—All the parables of Christ are founded upon facts: & *we cannot suppose* that he would frame a parable upon so e*roneous a model*, as these notions of the Jews must be, u*the supposition* that Universalism is true!!!

This passage constitutes the basis upon which the Universalists rest their explanation of the 24th and 25th of St. Matthew.* But properly understood, it affords them no support whatever.

The disciples enquired: "When shall these things be and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world." (xxiv. 3.) This question was asked on Christs having (in the 2d verse,) predicted the destruction of the temple. It is the opinion of some Commentators, that the disciples supposed, that the end of the world and the day of judgment, would immediately succeed the demolition of the temple:—they consequently blend the two events in their question. And as one event was to be a striking type of the other, Christ does not separate them in his answer. But if it be admitted that the disciples asked *only* of the end of the Jewish dispensation, it must still be clear to every attentive observer that Christ did not confine himself to that event. But in the true spirit of ancient prophesy he rises in his subject from less events to greater. The prophets often commence with *David*, & conclude with *Christ*—& commencing with the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, they almost imperceptably pass to the final return of the ransomed to glory.—So Christ commences his discourse with the end of the Jewish city and temple, priesthood & polity,—and by an easy transition, passes to *the end of the world*, and the general judgment. "Being asked by the disciples" says Tertulean "when these things which he had intimated concerning the destruction of the temple should take place, he set before them the order of the times, first concerning the Jews, till the destruction of Jerusalem, and then concerning men in general, till the end of the world." (See Scott's Commentary.)

The Editor finally asks: "Do not ancient prophesy the words of Jesus and his apostles, and well known fact teach in unison together, that the separation which then took place was between Jew & Gentile." (Ibid.) We scarcely know what he means by "a separation between Jew and Gentile"—We have been in the habit of thinking

*For further specimens of the dependence which is made upon these words, see Ballou on the Parables, Pages 148, 152, 164, &c.

that all these *high authorities* to which he refers, *teach* that the Jews and Gentiles had been *separate*, at *enmity*, &c. & that by the gospel they were made "both one—the middle wall of partition between them" was "broken down," &c. (See Eph. ii 14—17.) But that they had *grown together*, till the destruction of Jerusalem; and were then to be separated, to us is *new divinity!*

He next enquires "what was the punishment represented by the furnace of fire"—and thinks it refers to "those judgments which Christ pronounced upon the Jews—the destruction of their city & temple," &c. [Ibid.] To support this explanation he introduces two passages from the prophets. The first is Isa. xxxi. 9. 'Whose fire is in Zion and his fireman in Jerusalem'—This refers to the perpetual fire which was kept up in the temple:—or it may mean, who will appear in Zion like a fire to defend his people and consume their enemies. The other passage is Ezek. xxii. 19. 20. [Which see.] God's vengeance is often compared, in the scriptures, to fire, but here it was so literally, when both city and temple were consumed by him [See 2 Kings xxv. 9.] [On the above passages, see Pool's, Dr. Coke's, Dr. Clake's, and Mr. Benson's Commentaries.]

There is no evidence that these passages from the prophets, have reference to the same things that those which he is endeavoring to explain have. The similarity in the figures, is in no wise conclusive evidence of this. But if 'the furnace of fire' in the passage under consideration has any reference to the "judgments which Christ pronounced upon the Jews," this does not prove but that it has a still more literal reference, to the punishment of the finally impenitent.

He proceeds to meet a few particulars under our 3d remark. [The remark is in P. 29.] Under this, it was urged that upon the supposition of Universal Salvation—the expectation of the wicked shall not perish, but shall issue like that of the righteous, in gladness—To this he replies: "Our doctrine does not suppose that the false hope of the wicked will be realised in life or death. The hope of the Mahomedon founded on Mahomet, the hope of the heathen founded on their idol Gods, shall perish & *shall not be realised.*" [P. 166.] But supposing the ground *of their hope, or the particular way* in which they a

expecting salvation to fail; upon the universalist hypothesis the *end* will be *sure*. If the wicked are saved in any way. their hope will indeed" "issue in gladness," & will by no means "perish!"

He proceeds: "What were the hopes and expectations of the persecutors and murderers of Jesus Christ? Their hope and expectation were to destroy the influence of his doctrine. Did not their expectation fail? It certainly did. What is the hope and expectation of those who are opposed to the universal doctrine? If their expectation and hope correspond with their faith, theyare expecting and hoping for the endless damnation of a large portion of our race." [Ibid.] To all this we answer. 1. It was not intimated that upon the universalist hopothesis, every thing that the wicked hope for, in this life will be realised. And 2. As to our "hoping for the endless damnation," &c. we would ask: may not we believe a coming event without *hoping for it?* If not the holy prophets, yea Jesus Christ himself, and his apostles, when they denounced the most terrible judgments upon the Jewish nation, "if their hope correspond with their faith" must have *hoped* for these fearful events! In what light then, must their bitter lamentations over the approaching desolation be regarded, [may the gracious God pardon the supposition] but as the most monstrous hypocracy?—These are the consequences which flow from this mighty effort of our *Candid Examiner* to fix an odium upon our theory! But 3. As to the "portion of our race" which we are "expecting will be lost," we by no means suppose that it will be "large," in comparison with those who will be saved.—Considering the numbers which die in infancy, idiocy, and invincible ignorance:—The numbers of pious persons in all ages who live and die unobserved:—And also, that "there is an age approaching when righteousness will be universal: [See Is. xi. 9.] Considering the myriads that will be translated to heaven during this happy period, and it will not excite surprize, if the number of the lost of mankind will bear no greater proportion to the number of the saved, than the executions at Newgate, do to the inhabitants of the metropolis." (See Isaac, Pages 48, 49, 50, 51.)

The Editor continues: "They are sowing the doctrine of *eternal wrath* and misery. Well what a man soweth

that shall he also reap." (Ibid.) Did not this gentleman perceive that this *reflection*, (for it cannot be called an argument) bears as heavily upon himself as upon us? This he must perceive upon a little reflection. He believes & teaches that sinners shall be punished, and that too with such severity, as to authorise the following strong language of the apostle: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds, unto them who are contentious &c. *indignation* and *wrath*, *tribulation* and *anguish*"—"Well what a man sows such shall he also reap:"—The more he preaches this doctrine, the more dreadfully will the storm beat upon his own head, 'and his violent dealings come down upon his own pate!' With what mighty effect does this deadly stroke recoil upon himself?

He next gives us the following smart rebuff. "And if he thinks it strange that *tares* should be turned into wheat, we enquire where is the *saint* who was not made out of a sinner?" (Ibid.) In his reference here to a remark of ours, he has got *tares* for *chaff*:—this however is but the mistake of a word,—if all his errors were as harmless it would be well!—But if the gentleman will be so good as to tell us where the *saint* is, who was made out of a sinner, who had been consigned to '*unquenchable fire*' he will gain his point!

He proceeds to advance the following sentiment, and what he thinks proof of it: "It is expected that a man will reap his harvest where he sows his seed. There is no intimation in the above passages that he who soweth to the flesh shall reap the fruits of the seed which he sowed in the spiritual and eternal world. 'Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked & the sinner.'"(Ib.) Whether the passages referred to, refer to this world or the next, we shall enquire more particularly in the sequel. We would 1. observe: as to the passage which he has quoted to prove his principle, that the righteous do receive some recompense; & much more that the wicked and the sinner are visited, *in this world*, more or less, with divine judgments, by which the holy God testifies his displeasure against their evil ways, is what we have never denied: and this is all that is intended *in* the above text. It does not assert that *their whole recompence* is received in this world, and if it *did, it would* contradict the whole tenor of scripture.

This we shall have occasion fully to show in another place.

But 2. What he here lays down as a principle, (and it appears to be a favorite, and a fundamental principle with him too) that "a man will reap his harvest where he sows his seed"—that is, that a man will receive the whole amount of his punishment where he commits his crimes;—unless he supposes some men will continue to sin in another world—goes to preclude all punishment *beyond the grave.* For it would be injustice to punish any after they have received their full recompense, and this they are supposed to have received where they sinned—*in this world.* It would be satisfactory to know what our Examiner's views are upon this point; whether he believes *any will be punished after death, or not.* The general strain of his arguments, if we can perceive their tendency, says not:—but he does not come out and avow the sentiment openly. In his *work* he has published pieces from others, upon both sides without any expression of approbation or disapprobation on either side! His course upon this subject appears to savour much of *policy;*—he appears to want the privilege of taking either side, as the exigency of the case may require!!

But we would observe 3. that the principle that "man will reap his harvest where he sows his seed," goes effectually to destroy all connection between our *actions in this world,* and our *state in the world to come.* On this principle we conceive that no motive can be taken from the *future* and *eternal* world, to influence our actions *in this life.* If so the doctrine of immortality, can be of no vital importance to the cause of morality and practical piety. But if all motives drawn from the eternal world are entirely nugatory, how futile is a great part of the Bible?—it being one continued series of motives drawn from the future and eternal world, to induce a course of obedience in this!

What follows upon this proposition is an attempt to show the "gross absurdity" of our inferences from two passages.—"Observer says that on the doctrine of the restitution 'though he' the sinner 'may reap corruption as the fruit of his present doings, yet that corruption *would not be the* opposite of everlasting life, seeing it will *issue in it,*' &c. A person for some crime is sentenced

ten years imprisonment in a dungeon—he then is set at liberty. Would it do to say that the punishment he is to endure in his solitary dungeon, will not be opposed to liberty and the light of the sun, *seeing it will issue in it.*" [P. 166.] It appeared to us that there was a perfect antithesis, in these passages, between "corruption, indignation and wrath," &c. on the one hand; and "eternal life" on the other: which would be absurd were not the two in some repects equal. The supposition that the apostle would contrast a few days *suffering the lash, or taking a salutary medicine,* with an "*eternal weight of glory,*" without adding any thing to show its superiority in point of duration—or the connexion between them, appears to us, a "gross absurdity" with a witness!—His comparison is altogether irrevelant: In it the length and termination of the "imprisonment," is specified. If the apostle had as particularly limited the punishment of the wicked, this would have settled the question. But there is no limitation of this punishment: it is contrasted with "eternal life," and there it is left, to make the natural impression, that it must in some respects at least, be *equal.*

But to conclude. We now see no reason why we should change our views in relation to the passages which were quoted under our first proposition. That they do indeed express the *future and final states of men in contrast,* we still believe. Our Examiner, clearly perceiving that the inevitable consequence, from these passages, thus circumstanced, must be, that if the happiness of the righteous be endless, the misery of the wicked must be endless likewise, *denies that they refer to a future state at all.*—But in doing this he has in many instances, done violence to both the text and context;—and has neutralized some of the most direct evidences in the bible, for the eternal happiness of the righteous. We think it a clear case, that if *the eternal state,* is not asserted, in at least, some of these scriptures, it cannot be found in the bible. Let our *Examiner examine,* and show us where "life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel." And let him see, if he can find a passage, which may not as fairly be applied to the present state, as those which we have produced in *our first* argument. And if it do appear, that *in his zeal to do* away the doctrine of eternal punishment, *he also does* away that of eternal blessedness

it will certainly be no inconsiderable argument against his method of explaining the scriptures, & indeed against the theory, to defend which, he is forced to resort to such a method!!!

No. VII.—*The Argument founded upon the strength of the terms*, DEFENDED.

Our second argument is deduced from those passages which express the duration of future punishment by the terms *everlasting, eternal*, &c.

The editor enters upon the examination of this argument in his usual style, thus:—" He has assumed a position which should have been established before he proceeded in his arguments. If by future punishment he means punishment in a future state of being, he should have shown that these scriptures describe, and have relation to such punishment in distinction from the punishment inflicted in this state of being. Till he does this he is building upon a sandy foundation." (P. 166.) This would appear very singular, were it not the language of one who is in the habit of pressing his opponent to the labouring oar, when he should ply it himself!! We maintain, (and shall fully establish it in our next number,) that the *literal & proper* signification of the qualifying terms in question, is *interminable*, or *endless duration*. And " it is assumed as a first principle in the interpretation of language, that all other things being equal, the *primitive* and *literal* meaning of a word, is to be preferred to any *figurative* and *secondary* sense; and that if the connexion, or the nature of the case be such that it cannot be taken in its original signification, all other circumstances the same, that which is next to it is to be adopted; and so on through all the various significations which use has sanctioned."*

---

*Says Mr. Horne:—" Although the plain, obvious, and literal sense of a passage may not always exhibit the mind of the Holy Spirit, yet it is ordinarily to be preferred to the figurative sense, and is not to be rashly abandoned, unless absolute and evident

Upon this principle of interpretation (and who will contest it?) we have a perfect right to presume, that these terms in the places in question, are to be taken in their *literal* and *proper* sense. This ground we shall maintain until he shows that the connexion, or the nature of the case is such, that these words, in the places in question, should not be understood in their *proper* signification: until he does this, our "position" is by no means "assumed:"—it is legitimately our own. This point gained, it will be a matter of course, that the passages under consideration refer to "a future state of being"—unless what is strictly *endless* may have an *end*:—and this we suppose he will not assert. The burden of proof, upon this point, rests entirely upon him:—and until he proves that these terms are to be understood figuratively, in the passages under consideration, these passages are conclusive evidence in our favor. This he does attempt to do, by laboring to prove that they refer to this life only.—We will now pass to examine what he has directed to this point.

He explains Dan. xii. 2. by comparing it, and its connexions, with some passages in the 24th. of Mat. (P. 167.) We admit that this part of the prophecy of Daniel, and some parts of the prophecy of Christ, are very similar, and probably refer to the same events. But we have before shown the insufficiency of his reasons for applying the prophecy of Christ *exclusively* to the destruction of Jerusalem:—and as we have taken away his foundation, his superstructure of course cannot stand!

But as further evidence that this passage in Daniel, has its fulfilment in this life, he introduces the 3d verse:

---

necessity require such literal sense to be given up." (Horne's Introduction to a critical study and knowledge of the scriptures. Vol II. P. 500.)

And the learned Hooker:—"I hold it for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred scripture, that, where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art, which changes the meaning of words, as alchemy doth or would do the substance of metals, making of any thing what it pleases, and bringing in the end all truth to nothing." (Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Book V, Chapter 58—60.)

"They that be wise shall shine," &c. and remarks upon it as follows:—"They that turn many to righteousness." The verb is in the present tense. They shine forth while they are employed in turning many to righteousness, an evidence that they are on earth." (P. 169.) The verb *turn* is in the present tense to-be-sure:—but *shall shine*, and upon this the whole depends, is in the *first future* tense. He speaks as though there were but *one verb* in the passage and goes on to paraphrase it as though it were throughout in the "present tense." This he must certainly know is not the case. The critical acumen which he has displayed in this case, is really admirable!

This gentleman applies Mat. xxv. 46:—"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment," &c. to the punishment of the Jews, on the destruction of Jerusalem. (P. 167.) And to support this application of the passage he quotes Mat. xvi. 27, 28. (See P. 169.) "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you there be some standing here, which shall not taste death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Christ's *coming in the glory of his Father*, in the 27th verse, we conceive, refers to a different event from his *coming in his kingdom*, in the 28th. For this coming of which he first speaks is accompanied by circumstances which did not take place within the life time of any of those who were then standing there.

This coming is marked by the following circumstances: 1. He would come "in the glory of his Father." 2. "With his angels." And 3. Then he would "reward *every man* according to his works." Now in what sense does our Examiner suppose that this last particular, especially, (waving the others,) was fulfilled on the destruction of Jerusalem? Here is an *universal retribution* spoken of: "Then shall he reward *every man*."—It will not answer for the editor after what he has said upon the "unequivocal" meaning of the "term *every*" to say that "every man" means the Jewish nation only. This would be to abandon the ground which he has taken, and to give up many passages upon which he much relies, as supporting the doctrine of universal salvation. Now as we have

no evidence that Christ has yet come under the above circumstances, we must conclude that the coming there foretold is yet to take place.

But his *coming in his kingdom*, (verse 28) is of another kind, and not improperly adverted to upon this occasion. As though he had said: "And that you may not doubt, that there shall be a day of judgment, when I shall come clothed with divine majesty, to render unto men according to their actions in this life, let me assure you, there are some here present, that shall not die till they shall see a fair representation of this in events which will soon take place, especially in my coming to set up my mediatorial kingdom with great power and glory, in the increase of my church, and the destruction of mine enemies." Benson. [See also Wesley, Dr. Coke, and the Continuators of Pool, upon the place.] This passage then does not go to prove that the coming of Christ spoken of in Mat. xxv. 31—46, refers to the destruction of Jerusalem:—so far from this, that it plainly appears, that those parts of it which most resemble that passage, must themselves be referred to the *second coming of Christ*. But that the last paragraph of the 25th, of Mat., does not refer to the event to which the editor applies it, will perhaps appear more clearly after considering the following particulars:

1. On the coming referred to in this place, "all nations" are to be "gathered before him" and judged—rewarded or punished according to their respective characters:—But this did not take place on the destruction of Jerusalem.

2. Upon the occasion described by our Lord, the righteous are rewarded in consideration of the good character they had previously sustained: But this does not answer to the *gentiles* being received to the privileges of the gospel. (See Rom. x. 20. Isa. lxv. 1.)

But 3. The punishment to be then awarded, to the wicked, is that which was "prepared for the devil and his angels:" But we know not where it is written, that being taken captives by the Romans, and sold for slaves among the different nations of the earth, is the punishment "prepared for the devil and his angels"! We need adduce no farther reasons at present, for rejecting his application of this portion of the scriptures: it is forced, ex

tremely unnatural, and is evidently an expedient to accommodate the peculiarities of his system.

He next notices some passages from the book of Rev. (See Rev. xiv. 10. 11.—xix. 3. xx. 10.) In order to limit these passages to the present world, he quotes chap. xvi. 1. Upon this he observes: "We here learn that the angels were commanded to pour out the vials containing the seven last plagues upon the earth; nothing said about reserving any to be poured out upon sufferers in an endless hell." [P. 169.] The phrase, "the earth" by a metonymy, is often used for the inhabitants of the earth, or some part of them. In the place which our Examiner quotes, this phrase refers to the inhabitants of the *anti-christian state.* Now in the name of reason, what does this prove concerning the duration of this punishment? Their being denominated "the earth" it seems, must, according to this Expositor, certainly prove that the "fulfilment" of the prophecy in relation to them is "confined to time." Conclusive reasoning indeed!

Again he says: "When the duration of this torment is expressed by the terms forever, and forever & ever, these terms are put in apposition with day and night, clearly indicating that this torment is endured where time is measured by day and night." (PP. 169, 170.) Answer. The phrase "*day & night*" in this place is evidently used figuratively, for *continually—unceasingly.* This is the more clear, as it is used in this sense, in other places in this book. In chap. iv. 1—8. it is said: "And the four beasts rest not *day and night* saying holy, holy Lord God Almighty." Again vii. 15. "Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him *day and night* in his temple," &c. Now will the gentleman say, that these passages describe what occurs "where time is measured by day and night."—If not where is his argument?

But his argument may be successfully retorted: *day & night* "is put in apposition with" *forever and ever*—"clearly indicating" that it is equivalent, or implies the same thing in this place—so, he is defeated by the reaction of his own argument!

Now candid reader; you have fairly before you, the editor's reasons for limiting the terms in question. Has he offered any thing like an argument, to show that these terms should be understood out of their natural meaning,

in the places which he has examined?—For our part we confess, we perceive no force at all in all that he has said upon this point:—The argument from these passages, as yet stands uneffected.

We shall next proceed to consider what the Editor has said upon the authorities which we produced to shew the meaning and extent of the terms *everlasting, eternal,* &c. (See this work pp. 30—32.)

He says: "The statements of these learned Doctors—serve only to establish what the learned well know, that these words sometimes express an endless and sometimes a limited duration." [P. 170.] This is a gross misrepresentation of what is expressed in the quotations in question, at least as to two of them. These authors do not say what these terms "sometimes express:"—but what is their "proper grammatical sense." This Dr. Clarke says is "continued being:" and Mr. Fuller, "always being." What is the *proper and literal* sense of these terms is the question:—and to this we shall closely adhere.—That they are *sometimes* used in a *limited* sense, we do not deny; but this is nothing to the point. Let him show that this is the case in those passages which speak of future punishment:—until he does this, he begs the question;—and is himself "building upon a sandy foundation"! He has indeed made an effort to establish this point, but with what success we have just seen.

He continues: "Endless misery finds no support from these words; they are qualifying terms and the extent of their signification is entirely governed by the things which they qualify." [Ibid.] What is this but saying that "they are qualifying terms," and yet they do not *qualify the subjects* to which they are applied, but the *subjects qualify* them? In this case we should suppose that the words to which they are applied would be the 'qualifying terms.' An old rule in grammar, is, that "an adjective is a word added to a substantive, to express its quality:"—but according to the Universalist Interpreters, this rule should now be reversed,—and should be: a substantive is a word added to an adjective to express its quality! What work these Linguists make, to establish their notions! In order to invalidate the evidence with which they are met, from the scriptures, they torture to death, both the rules *of language and common sense*!!!

The editor is also much mistaken in relation to the passage which we quoted from Dr. Huntington. He says, in this, the Doctor "gives what was once his opinion upon these words—before his eyes were opened," &c. and in this way he accounts "for the absurdity so visible in the extract." [Ibid.] But this extract is taken from *Calvanism Improved*—a vindication of the doctrine of universalism: and was indeed his opinion when an universalist, as any one must know who has the smallest acquaintance with his system. There would be "absurdity visible in the extract," if the Doctor held to universal salvation upon the principle of *every man's receiving the whole of his punishment*, as does the editor:—but instead of this, he asserts this doctrine upon the ground of *Christ's suffering the whole of the sinner's punishment, as his substitute.* He says: "This doctrine of saving *universal grace* is perfectly consistent with the most plain and positive declarations of the word of God, that the pains of hell shall be endless; and that the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, in all the boundless extent of these words, and many others that convey the same idea of the endless punishment of sinners, and that in the plainest possible manner of expression. In their surety, Vicar, or substitute, i. e. in Christ 'the head of every man' they go away into *everlasting punishment* in a true and gospel sense." [See Calvinism Improved pp. 164—165.]

We do not intend to attempt a refutation of the Doctor's scheme;* but have judged it necessary so far to give a view of it, as to show that what is expressed in the extract above alluded to, is perfectly consistent with his scheme of universal salvation: And that his, is indeed what we presented it for:—the testimony of an universalist:—the editor to the contrary notwithstanding!

But the editor thinks that the extract in question, "Shows how weak the arguments in support of endless misery are, when predicated upon the strength of these terms," for he "should think that even God himself could choose language to express *interminable* punishment *much plainer* than it is by the original words translated *forever*, signi-

*This scheme is ably refuted by Dr. Strong in the 3d part of his book entitled, "The doctrine of Eternal Misery reconciled with the Infinite Benevolence of God."

fying an *age. a long period, or interminable duration.*" [Ibid.] The Doctor says in this extract that the "bible says that sinners shall be damned to *interminable punishment,* as plain as language can express, or any man, or even God himself can speak." and expresses great astonishment "that some who believe that all mankind shall in the end be saved, will *trifle* with a few words, and most of all with the original word and its derivatives translated forever, &c. and says that "all the learned know that this word in the Greek signifies an *age,* a *long period,* or *interminable duration.*" Now it is plain that he predicates the assertion that "the bible" asserts "that sinners shall be damned to *interminable punishment.*" & his charge of *trifling* against some of the universalists, upon the signification of the "original word and its derivatives translated *forever,* &c. This word he says "signifies an *age,* a *long period,* or *interminable duration.*" From the whole of this, we can come to no other conclusion than that he supposed this "word and its derivatives," *literally and properly* to signify "*interminable duration,*"—though they might be used *figuratively* and *improperly,* for "an *age*" or "a *long period.*" We cannot make good sense of what this author says in any other way, and in this way of understanding him, he displays no *weakness* in the argument drawn from the strength of the terms:—but did he indeed display *weakness,* it would lie in the author's manner of stating the argument, & not in the argument itself.

Dr. Huntington held to *universal Salvation*; but he did not arrive at his conclusions in the ordinary way:—he admitted the *infinite evil of sin*;—the proper force and meaning of all the Divine threatenings;—& the "boundless extent" of the terms used in relation to future punishment. But he believed the sinner would be *eternally damned in his substitute,* and not in *person.*

Dr. H's. system does not differ materially from what is called the *Rellian System,* from John and James Relly, of England. This system is exhibited in a Book entitled "Relley's Union."* It is said that this system is

*The main principles of this book are overturned by Dr. Edwards in a few pages, in the Appendix to his book against Dr. Chauncey.

held by Mr. Mitchell of New York.* It is however severely reprobated by Mr. Kneeland.† Much as the schemes of these mighty champions of Universalism are at variance: when the doctrine of eternal punishment is to be contested, *they move in unison.*

No. VIII.—*The argument from the strength of the terms,* RESUMED.

In this number we shall give the argument which is deduced from the strength of the terms used in relation to future punishment something more at length. And we propose to observe the following order:

I. To give additional authorities for the proper and literal meaning of the words rendered *everlasting.* &c. II. Show the sense in which these words are used by the sacred Writers. & III. That the particular construction in which they are used in relation to punishment, is never used for limited duration.

I, We are to give some additional authorities to show that the proper and literal meaning of the terms in question, is duration *absolutely endless.*

By the ancient Latin writers, the word *aion* is translated *ævum* and *æternitas:* and *aionios, æternus.* "This word (*aion*) is translated by Sully and others, sæculum, ætas, annus, and æternitas. Athanasius, Jerome, Hillary, and Ambrose, render aionios, æternus. Chrysostom speaking of the punishment which is qualified by aion says, that 'it is a punishment from which they escape not.' And Theopholact, that it is 'not to be remitted either here or elsewhere, but to be endured both here and elsewhere.' Cyprian renders it æternus. His language is, 'guilty of an eternal sin never to be blotted out.'" LEIGH'S CRITIRA SACRA.

---

*See Tract No 1, published by the New York Universalist Book Society

†See Kneeland's Lectures pp. 108—110. A Note.

"In the Vulgate Latin version, the word aion is almost constantly rendered æternus. So it is likewise by the early Christian Fathers. Jerome, in his Commentary on Mat. xxv. 41, uses the following language: 'Let the prudent reader attend to the fact, that the punishments are *eternal*, and the life *perpetual*, that he may thus escape the danger of ruin? Tertulian, in his apology against the heathen, in allusion to the same passage says, that the righteous shall enter upon the retribution of *eternal* life, and the wicked shall go into fire *equally* perpetual and durable. Irenæus, that 'the fire is *eternal* which my Father has prepared for the devil and his angels.' Again he quotes the text Mat. xxv. 41. thus: 'Depart ye cursed into *eternal* fire, which my Father has prepared for the devil and his angels,' and then adds this comment: 'Because intimating that *eternal* fire was not prepared principally for man, but for him who seduced him and caused him to sin.' And again: 'punishment *not only temporal but eternal.*' Chrysostom in his Latin works, homily xvi. speaking on Mat. xxv. 41. uses this language: 'Go' he says 'ye cursed into *eternal* fire.'"

THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

(A magazine published in Philadelphia,) Vol. III. pp. 156. 157. An able article signed A. C.

In the Lexicons these words are translated thus: aion, Ærum, æternitas, sœculum; quasi (as if) aei on always being, or existing, HEDERICUS.

Aion ærum, mundus, sœculum: q. e. (which is) aei on. SCHREVELIUS.

Aionios is æternus, sempeternus, perennis. HEDERICUS. Æternus. SCHREVELIUS.

The Latin words above are defined in English as follows: *Ærum*, Eternity, an age. *Æternitas*, Eternity, Duration without beginning or end. *Sœculum* an age, the life of men, the world. *Mundus*, the world, the universe. *Æternus* 1. Eternal. 2. Continual. 3. Of long continuance. *Sempiternus*, Endless, perpetual, continual, everlasting. *Perennis*. 1. That continueth all the year round. 2. Lasting durable. 4. Never failing, 5. Constant, steady, steadfast, 6. perpetual, incessant, continual, uninterrupted. 7. Eternal, endless, everlasting.

AINSWORTH.

"Aion.—This word occurs also in the New Testament; it answers to the Hebrew word olam, whose various meanings it takes.

"9. Eternity the whole duration whether it be without beginning or end. Of duration without end it is used in imitation of the Hebrew olam Mat. vi. 13. he glory forever.

"2. Every thing which is without end, especially what will come to pass after this life, and the end of the world; in this sense the word is used in all those places in the New Testament where the words eternal fire, eternal judgment, eternal condemnation, eternal punishment, &c. occur, for by such expressions the perpetual punishment of crimes, which the wicked suffer after this life, their future uninterrupted miserable state, is pointed out & so the phrases of an opposite kind, eternal habitations, eternal life, &c. the state and condition of the constant happiness of the pious after death is pointed out."*

SCHLEUSNER.

"Aion q. aei on, *always being*. It denotes *duration* or *continuance of time*, but with great variety. I. Both in the singular and plural it signifies *eternity*, whether past or to come. John iv. 14. vi. 51. Eph. iii. 11. I. Tim. i. 17.

"II. *The duration of this world* Mat. xxviii. 20. comp. Mat. xiii. 39.

"III. *The ages of the world.*

"IV. *This present life, this world.*

"V. *The world to come. the next life.* Mark x. 30. Luke xviii. 30. Comp. Luke xx. 35.

"*Aionios*, from *aion*.

"I. *Eternal, having neither beginning or end.* Rom. xvi. 26. (Comp. I Tim. i. 17.) Heb. ix. 14.

"II. *Eternal without end.* Mat xxv. 41. 46. II. Thes. i. 9."

PARKHURST.

"SCAPULA says that aion is as if it were spoken AIEI ON *being always*. For this etymology and explanation he refers to Aristotle and Philo, both of whom declare unequivocally, that it means an absolute eternity." (See M'Calla on Universalism P. 291.)

---

*This is a translation of Schleusner, from the Methodist Magazine, Vol. III. P. 271.

"*The everlasting God.*—'el olam JEHOVAH *the strong God, the eternal one.* This is the first place in the scriptures in which *olam* occurs as an *attribute* of God, and here it is evidently designed to point out his utmost duration: that it can mean no *limited time* is self evident, because nothing of this kind can be attributed to God. The Septuagint renders the words *Theos aionios the ever existing God.* From this application of the words, we learn that *olam* and *aion* originally signified ETERNAL, or *duration without end, olam* signifies *he was hidden, concealed or kept secret:** and *aion* according to Aristotle, De Cælo, Lib. 1. Chap. 9, and a higher authority need not be sought, is compounded of *aei always,* and *on being*—*aeon estin apo tou aei einai.* The same author informs us that God was termed *Aisan,* because he was *always existing kaleitai Aisan de aei ousan.* De Mundo, Chap. 2. in fine. Hence we see that no words can more forcibly express the grand characteristics of eternity than these. It is that duration which is *concealed, hidden* or

*"It hath been said, that there is nothing in the hebrew root *lam* and its derivatives, which imply endless duration; and that it can be thus understood only when the nature of the subject necessarily requires it, as when it is applied to God. This matter deserves attention. It is known that one meaning of this word is *hid* or *obscured*; and I have no doubt but this was its original meaning, as all words were first applied to sensible objects. A finite mind cannot comprehend infinite; so that infinite or eternal duration, is in its nature hidden or incomprehensible by man. But no limited duration, be it ever so long, is in its nature incomprehensible or hidden.—The original application of this word to duration in the Hebrew language, was doubtless on the ground I have mentioned; and its natural meaning is duration in its nature incomprehensible; and none but endless or eternal duration is such. There is great beauty and energy in applying the word in this manner to the existence of God, and to other things which are eternal in the endless sense. In the Greek language, absolute eternity is expressed by the quality of existing or continuing always. In the Hebrew, from its being hidden, or incomprehensible in its nature, by a finite mind. In the Latin from its being without end or limit, and in the English by a derivation from the Latin in the same manner." Dr. Strong. (See Benevolence and misery pp. 100, 101.)

kept secret from all created beings:—which is *always existing*, still running ON, but never running OUT—one *interminable incessant*, and *immeasurable duration*: it is THAT, in the *whole of which* God alone can be said to exist; and that which the *eternal mind* can alone *comprehend*.

"In all languages words have, in process of time, deviated from their original acceptations, and have become accommodated to particular purposes, and limited to particular meanings. This has happened both to the Hebrew olam and to the Greek aion: they have been both used to express a *limited* time, but, in general, a time, the limits of which are *unknown*; and thus a pointed reference to the *original ideal meaning* is still kept up.—— Those who bring any of these terms in an accommodated sense, to favor a particular doctrine, &c. must depend on the good graces of their opponents for permission to use them in this way. For as the real grammatical meaning of both words is *eternal*, and all other meanings only *accommodated* ones, sound criticism, in all matters of dispute concerning the import of a word or term, must have recourse to the grammatical meaning, and its use among the earliest and most correct writers in the language, and will determine all accommodated meanings, by this alone. Now the first and best writers in both languages apply olam and aion to express *eternal* in the proper meaning of that word." DR. CLARKE. (See his note upon Gen. xxi. 33)

From the above authorities, (and though *better* cannot be obtained, yet *more* of the same character might be added,) it appears from the etymology of the original Hebrew and Greek words rendered *eternal*, &c. and from their use among the earliest and best writers in those languages, that their literal and proper meaning is infinite duration—always being. On the principle of interpretation which we have laid down in the preceding number, the ground is now fairly gained, until our opponent shows that these words are to be taken in a figurative and an improper sense, when used in reference to future punishment. Though what immediately follows, is not absolutely essential to the argument: —it will however greatly corroborate it. We shall now proceed to enquire for,

II. The use which the sacred Writers make of these words.

In this part of the enquiry we shall confine ourselves to the New Testament, and of course to the Greek word *aion* and its derivatives; as every thing material in this part of the controversy will be embraced in this range. That these words are to be taken in the unlimited sense when applied to punishment, is corroborated by the sense in which they are used when applied to other subjects. This we shall now show by referring to all the places in which they occur and showing the senses in which they are used.

"Aion," says Dr. Edwards, in his reply to Dr. Chauncey, "reckoning the reduplications of it, to be but single instances of its use, occurs in the New Testament in one hundred and four instances; in thirty two of which, it means a temporary duration.* In seven it may be taken in either the temporary or endless.† In sixty-five, including six instances in which it is applied to future punishment, it plainly signifies an endless duration.‡ How then could Dr. C. say, that it is *commonly* if not *always* used in the sacred pages, to signify an age or dispensation only? And that this is almost the perpetual use of it.

*The places are Mat. xii, 32, xiii, 22, 38, 40, 49 xxiv, 3, xxviii, 20, Mark iv, 19 Luke i, 70, xvi, 8, xx, 34, 35, Acts iii, 21, Rom. xii, 2, I Cor. i, 20, ii, 6, twice, 7, 8, iii, 18, x, 11, 2 Cor. iv, 4, Gal. i, 4, Eph. i, 21, ii, 2, vi, 12, 1 Tim. vi, 17, 2 Tim. iv, 10, Tit. ii, 12, Heb. i, 2, ix, 26, xi, 3.

†The places are, Mark x, 30, Luke xviii. 30, John ix, 32, Eph. ii, 7. iii, 9, Col. i, 26, Heb. vi, 5.

‡The places are as follows: Mat. vi, 13, xxi, 19, Mark xi, 14, Luke i, 33, 55, John iv, 14, vi, 51, 58, viii, 25, twice, 51, 52, x, 28, ix, 26, xii, 34, xiii, 8, xiv, 16, Acts xv, 18, Rom. i, 25, ix, 5, xi, 36, xvi, 27, 1 Cor. viii, 13, 2 Cor. ix, 9, xi, 31, Gal. i, 5, Eph. iii, 11, 21, Phil. iv, 20, 1 Tim. i, 17, twice, 2 Tim. iv, 18, Heb. i, 8, v, 6, vi, 20, vii, 17, 21, 24, 28, xiii, 8, 21, 1 Pet. i, 23, 25, iv, 11, v, 11, 2 Pet. iii, 18, 1 John ii, 17, 2 John 2, Rev. i, 6, 18, iv, 9, 10, v, 13, 14, vii, 12, x, 6, xi, 15, xv, 7, xxii, 5.—The six instances in which it is applied to future punishment, are, Mark iii, 29, 2 Pet. ii, 17, Jud. 13, Rev. xiv, 11, xix, 3, xx, 10.

"The adjective *aionios* is still more unfavorable to Dr. C's. system. It is found in seventy one places in the whole New Testament: sixty-six, beside the five in which Dr. C. allows it is applied to future punishment.* In every one of the sixty-six instances, except two II. Tim. i. 9. Tit. i. 2. it may, to say the least, be understood in the endless sense." (See Edwards against Chauncey pp. 251. 252.)

Another writer gives the following distribution of the senses in which the words occur. "Without having respect to the words as substantive or adjective, or to their number as singular or plural, I find they occur *one hundred & ninety-nine* times in the New Testament. I have examined every place where they are to be found, & have arranged them, as belonging to the different subjects under the following heads:

To the Mosaic dispensation—	9.
The world itself with the various ages and revolutions which have passed.	34.
God, Christ, and the Holy Ghost, together with the reign of Christ,	46.
Ascriptions of glory & praise to God, Christ, &c.	24.
Eternal life and blessedness,	65.
Eternal death and punishment,	21.
(SEE METHODIST MAGAZINE, Vol. III. P. 217.)	
	199.

According to this distribution, leaving out the 21 times in which it is applied to punishment, the word is used 135 times in the endless sense, to 43 times in the limited sense. If we were then to decide upon the sense in which the words are to be taken in the places where they are ap-

*The places are, Mat. xix, 16, 29, xxv, 46, Mark x, 17,30, Luke x, 25, xvi, 9, xviii, 18, 30, John iii, 15, 16, 36, iv, 14, 36, v, 24, 39, vi, 27, 40, 47, 54, 68, x, 28, xii, 25, 50, xvii, 2, 3, Acts, xiii, 46, 48, Rom. ii, 7, v, 21, vi, 22, 23, xvi, 25, 26, 2 Cor. iv, 17, 18, v, 1, Gal. vi, 8, 2 Thess. ii, 16, 1 Tim. i, 16, vi, 12, 16, 19, 2 Tim. i, 9, ii, 10, Tit. i, 2, twice, iii, 7, Philem. 15, Heb. v, 9, vi, 2, ix, 12, 14, 15, xiii, 20, 1 Pet. v, 10, 2 Pet. i, 11, 1 John i, 2, ii, 25, iii, 15, v, 11, 13, 20, Jude 7, 21, Rev. xiv, 6.—The five texts in which Dr. C. allows *aionois* to be applied to future punishment are, Mat. xviii, 8, xxv, 41, 46, Mark iii, 29, 2 Thess. i, 9. To which is to be added Jude 7.

plied to punishment. by the sense in which they are generally used, the comparative evidence in favor of the unlimited sense, is, to the limited. as 135 is to 43. Farther: If the words in question do not express unlimited duration there are no terms in the Greek language which do. In this case it would have been impossible for the writers of the New Testament to have found appropriate terms. in the language in which they wrote, to express the proper eternity of God—or the endless duration of the happiness of the righteous. This must have occasioned them many perplexities and embarrassments, whenever they had occasion to introduce these subjects. But does any thing of this appear?—Is there the smallest evidence, from any source, of such poverty in the Greek language? Not any indeed, but a torrent of evidence to the contrary!

III. We proceed to show that these words are used in a particular construction, when applied to punishment, in which they are never used in a limited sense.

"But" says Dr. Edwards: "if aion used absolutely did generally signify a mere temporary duration: it would not thence follow, that it has the same restricted signification when governed by the preposition *eis*. It is never applied to future punishment but in this construction.—In the whole New Testament it is used in this construction, sixty-one times, in six of which it is applied to future punishment.* That in all the remaining fifty-five it is used in the endless sense, I appeal to the reader. If in those fifty-five instances it be used in the endless sense; this surely is a ground of strong presumption, that in the six instances, in which it is applied to future punishment, it is used in the same sense." (Ibid.)

Now if the radical and proper signification of the words rendered *eternal, forever, &c.* is *always being*:—If these words are ordinarily used by the New Testament writers to express endless duration:—And finally, if they are

*In this construction it is found in all the texts mentioned in the last marginal note, in page 89, except Acts. xv, 18, Eph. iii, 11, 21. Once in 1 Tim. i, 17, and 2 Pet. iii, 18.

I have been thus particular in noting all the texts, in which *aion* occurs in the New Testament, that the reader may examine them and judge for himself, whether I have given adjust representation of the use of that word by the inspired writers.

used in a construction when applied to future punishment, in which they are never used in a limited sense:—Does it not amount to a moral certainty, that when these words are connected with future punishment they express the *absolute eternity of that punishment* ?

Now after all this evidence upon this subject would our readers suppose that any man had the temerity to declare himself " able to prove that these words do not, in any instance, necessarily convey the idea of eternity ; nor yet of an endless duration of time?" And yet this declaration is made by a man who has thought himself sufficiently acquainted with the Greek language to give to the public a new version of the New Testament!—A man of no less pretensions as a critic and a polemic than the Rev. A. Kneeland!! (See his Lectures P. 189.).

The main argument by which he attempts to support this extraordinary position is " that the substantive, or *root* is used in the plural number. For" he says " every *school-boy* who has paid any attention to his grammar, knows that a noun or substantive. expressive of time, which is used in the plural number, cannot give an idea of duration without end ; but must be a period that has both beginning & end ; otherwise there could be but one of the kind. And this is the case in all languages as well as the english"—(See Lectures P. 190.) This criticism did not originate with Mr. K. It was wielded by Mr. Vidler in opposition to Mr. Fuller,and the latter gentleman very fairly meets it as follows: " Words in English that are properly expressive of endless duration,— may not ordinarily admit of a plural ; and, if this were universally the case, it would not follow, that it is the same in Greek. Nor is it so: for the idea of endless duration, is frequently conveyed by these very plural forms of expression.—Thus in Eph. iii, 11. *kata prothesin ton aionon ; according to his eternal purpose.* 1 Tim. i, 17. *To de Basilei ton aionon aphtharto,aorato,mono sopho Theo time kai doxa eis tous aionas ton aionon, Now unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever & ever*—Render these passages how you will, you cannot do them justice, unless you express the idea of unlimited duration. And though the English terms may not admit of what is termed a plural form, yet they admit of what is equal to it; for though we do not say *everlas-*

tings nor *eternities* yet we say *forever & ever*; and you might as well contend, that *forever* cannot properly mean unlimited duration, seeing another *ever* may be added to it, as that *aion* must needs mean a limited duration, on account of its admitting a plural form of expression.—You might also with equal propriety, plead for a plurality of *evers* in futurity, from the phraseology, as for a plurality of *ages* from the Greek." VI. Letter to Mr. Vidler.—See Fuller's works Vol. II, pp. 381, 382.) After this reply the objection should have rested forever. But it is urged by Mr. K. with as much assurance as though it had never been successfully met:—and indeed as tho' it were a discovery of his own!

Mr. Kneeland thinks he has found a term more expressive of endless duration that those which are applied to punishment: and argues from it thus: "Speaking of our great high priest, who was made priest by an oath, after the order of Melchisedec and not after the order of Aaron. St. Paul saith (Heb. vii, 16.) 'Who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life (*alla kata dunamin Zoes akatalutou*) *but according to the power (akatalutou) of indissoluble life.*—Here is a word in the original which is not connected with punishment, *misery*, or *death*, any where in the whole Bible; yet it is connected with *life* to denote its durability. If this word could have been so much as once found connected with *death* in the same manner as it is here with *life*, it would have given more support to the doctrine of *endless misery* than all that is contained in the bible beside. Is it not strange, if St. Paul believed in this unmerciful doctrine, that he did not so much as once, in all his writings, connect it with *punishment* or *death*?" (See Lectures P. 196.) The word *akatalutos* according to Parkhurst is from *a neg. & katalútos dissolved*, which is from *kataluo to dissolve. Not to be dissolved, indissoluble*—[See Lexicon] and is only once used in the New Testament. But if this word is more significant of endless duration than those generally used why is it not ordinarily used in connection with the existence of God and the happiness of the righteous?—This must be unaccountable.

This argument, as the former, was urged by Mr. Vidler and was replied to by Mr. Fuller thus: "It is

true, the term *akatalutos* is here applied to *life;* but not as you insinuate, to that life of future happiness which is opposed to punishment. The life here spoken of, is that which pertains to our Lord's priesthood, which is opposed to that of Aaron, wherein men *were not suffered to continue by reason of death.* The word signifies *indissoluble;* and being applied to the nature of a priesthood which death could not *dissolve* is very properly rendered *endless.* It possibly *might* be applied to the endless happiness of good men, as opposed to the *dissoluble,* or transitory enjoyments of the present state; but as to the punishment of the wicked, supposing it to be endless, I question whether it be at all applicable to it. I can form no idea how the term *indissoluble,* any more than *incorruptible* can apply to punishment. The word *kataluo* to *unloose,* or *dissolve,* is true is said to refer to travellers *loosing* their own burdens, or those of their beasts, when they are resting by the way: but there are no examples of its having been used with reference to the termination of punishment; nor does it appear to be applicable to it.—In its most common acceptation in the New Testament, it signifies to *destroy,* or *demolish*—and you will scarcely suppose the sacred writers to suggest the idea of *destruction* which *cannot be destroyed.*" (VI. Letter to Vidler.)

In fact the word *akatalutos* is no more expressive of duration without end than the words *aion & aionios*:—and could just as well be used figuratively, or in an accommodated sense. It might be said of the matrimonial covenant that it is *indissoluble* because it is made for life, or of any compact, that it is *indissoluble,* if it is intended by the parties, to continue a long time, or indefinitely.

It will not be pretended but that the English words *eternal* and *endless* naturally signify unlimited duration. But who has not read, or heard, of the *eternal snows* of the polar regions—*eternal fame,* &c. And who but has often heard in familiar conversation of an *endless talker*—an *endless task*—an *endless contention,* &c. But what would be thought of a person who would come forward & argue from this, that these terms are indeterminate; and do not naturally signify any thing more than a *long time?* The strongest terms in any language may be used in an accommodated sense: but would it be good logic to conclude from this that they have no natural determin-

ate meaning, or if they have any, that it is no more extensive than the accommodated one? This would be considered sophistry so wretched as not to require a serious refutation:—but it would be precisely of a piece with the reasoning of our universalist opponents upon this subject.

No. IX.—*The argument from implication* DEFENDED.

Our third argument in favour of eternal punishment, is built upon a number of scriptures which are supposed to imply the doctrine. The editor has remarked upon quite a large proportion of these scriptures: —whatever is of importance in his remarks we shall now carefully consider.

In his commencement he complains that we "have not introduced one argument to support that the many passages" which we have "quoted, have reference to that punishment to which" we apply "them." (P. 179.) It is difficult for us to perceive what he would require of us. Our arguments are founded upon the natural and obvious meaning of these passages;—would he have us bring *arguments* to prove that the language employed in them means what it is commonly understood to mean? It appears to us that he ought rather to bring "arguments to prove" that it means something else:—and until he does which, the natural meaning must stand.

He now gives us a number of criticisms upon Mat. xii. 31, 32. and Mark iii, 29. which speak of *the sin against the Holy Ghost.* He informs us that the "true and original meaning" of the Greek word *aion*, is, "dispensation" and gives to us what he considers "a more proper translation of the passage" (Mat. xii, 39.) thus: "It shall not be forgiven him neither in this dispensation, neither in the dispensation to come:" and adds the following paraphrase: "i. e. neither in the dispensation of the law of Moses,—neither in the dispensation which was to follow." (Ibid.) We need add nothing upon the proper meaning of the word *aion*: this subject we have sufficiently discussed in the preceding number. But it

we were to allow that *aioni*, in this place, signifies *dispensation;* will it be possible for him to show that "the dispensation to come," is not the last and final dispensation of mercy to fallen man? Where is his proof that there will be another dispensation, after the dispensation of the gospel is closed, in which forgiveness will be extended to this sin, or to any other? It is not so clear to us that the "mode of expression" implies any such thing, but entirely to the contrary! In proof of this he quotes Eph. ii, 7. i, 10. But before these passages will afford him any help he must show that 'the ages to come' and 'the dispensation of the fulness of time,' refer to *ages*, &c. beyond 'the world to come'—and that in these passages there is a promise of *forgiveness* to the *sin against the Holy Ghost:*—but this he will not be able to do.

He gives us another specimen of his critical knowledge and research, in what he calls "a correct translation" of Mk. iii, 29. 'hath never forgiveness,' as follows: "Hath not forgiveness [eis ton aiona] unto the dispensation or age:"—and remarks: "*eis ton aiona* unto the age or dispensation, is left out, which perverts the text." [Ibid.] Here we beg leave to dissent:—*Eis ton aiona* is the phrase, commonly rendered *forever*. *Ouk échei aphesin eis ton aiona*, is literally, *hath not forgiveness forever*, or *to eternity*. This, every reader will at once perceive, is precisely the same in sense, as, *hath never forgiveness*. *Eis ton aiona* says the learned Dr. Geo. Campbell, with a negative particle, when the sense is not confined by the verb, has invariably the same meaning, which is *never*. [See his note on John viii, 51.]

But we will now put this subject within the grasp of the plainest reader. We will refer to a number of passages where this phrase [*eis ton aiona*] occurs, and render and explain them according to our editor, and then see where his criticism will lead him.

"But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst. [John iv, 14.] According to his translation: shall not thirst (*eis ton aiona*) unto the dispensation, or age! "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever." (vi, 51.) i. e. he shall live unto the dispensation! "If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death." [viii, 51.]—He shall not see death unto the dispensation! "And I give unto them eternal life,

and they shall never perish." (x, 28.) They shall not perish unto the dispensation. "And whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die." (xi, 26.) Shall not die unto the dispensation! "His righteousness remaineth *forever* (2 Cor. ix, 9.) i. e. unto the dispensation! "But he that doth the will of God abideth forever." (John ii, 17.) i. e. according to our translator, he abideth *(eis ton aiona)* unto the dispensation!

So according to this famous critic, those who drink of the living water shall not thirst unto the dispensation, but they may afterwards! Those who eat of the bread of life shall live, unto the dispensation, after which they may die—yea *die eternally!* Those who keep the sayings of Christ *shall not see death*, unto the dispensation:—but alas! what then? they may indeed see death! Christ's sheep to whom he gives *eternal life* shall not *perish*, unto the dispensation, but *then* they may indeed *perish!* Those who live and believe on Christ, shall not die, unto the dispensation, but *then*, sad to tell, they may *die!* The righteousness of those who disperse abroad, and give to the poor, remaineth, unto the dispensation, but perhaps no *longer!* And he that doeth the will of God, abideth unto the dispensation, but *then* he may be *removed!* These are the consequences to which the gentleman's "correct translation" will lead him! Nothing need be added to show their absurdity.

He proceeds next to examine Heb. vi, 6. 'It is impossible to renew them again unto repentence.' (See P. 180.) These words he thinks only "teach if they fall away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance *in the same way* they were first renewed." But pray sir, in what other way would you have them renewed? As you have not told us, and as we have nothing in the scriptures upon the subject, we must still wait to be informed.

But he enquires: "If it is impossible for such ever to be reclaimed—why all the exhortations to them to return?" The editor would do well to distinguish between a state of *partial backsliding* and that of *total apostacy*:—in one case they are exhorted to return; in the other we know not that they are. Now without *repentance* there can be no salvation: but here is a case in which repentance

is *impossible*:—Therefore in this case there can be no salvation.

Much of his explanation of Heb. x, 26, 'There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,' is in perfect accordance with our views. As he says: "There was no other" sacrifice "which would prove availing: even the sacrifice of Jesus was of no effect while they rejected it."—"The case" says Dr. Clarke "is that of a *deliberate apostate;* one who has utterly rejected Jesus Christ and his atonement, and renounced the whole gospel system. To him there remaineth *no more sacrifice for sins;* for there was but ONE Jesus; and this he has utterly rejected"

But to save himself, the editor must attempt to show that these characters will ultimately receive Christ; and so, though no other sacrifice will avail for them, yet they will be interested in *this*. But the scriptures by which he attempts to establish this point we have previously explained: (See pp. 22—25, & 64, 65.) and this explanation remains unanswered.

He now passes to consider Luke ix, 25. 'What is a man advantaged if he shall gain the whole world and lose himself or be cast away.' [See P. 181.] He would not have been so hard set to comprehend what we meant 'by a man being lost in a desert and yet saved in fact,' had he attentively considered what he quotes from us a few lines below, thus: 'But he cannot be lost so as to be *cast away* and yet finally saved.' Our idea was simply this: that a man could not be *cast away finally*, and yet be *finally saved*. And it appeared to us that it was a *final casting away*, which our Lord intended.

But he attempts to make out from Rom. xi, 2. 15, that those who are *cast away* will be "regained." Now it is evident that the apostle speaks of *casting away* in two different senses. In one sense Israel was not *cast away*, verse 2. 'God hath not cast away his people.' But in another, they were; for verse 15, he says, 'if the *casting away* of them be the riches of the world,' &c. They were not *irrecoverably* cast away, but were *rejected* or cut off from the privileges of the visible church; but if they did not 'abide still in unbelief,' they should 'be grafted in again.' [verse 23.] But is it certain from this that those who lose themselves, or are cast away, in our Lord's sense, and in the sense which the apostle first mentions,

will ever "be received as life from the dead?" Certainly not!

His next effort is to defend his system against the conclusion which was drawn from the words of Christ concerning Judas. [Mat. xxvi. 24.] 'It had been good for that man if he had not been born.' He first remarks:—"The verbs being in the present tense will allow this conclusion, it had been good for him if he had not been born then." [Ibid.] It is extremely unpleasant for us to be under the necessity to detect a man of our Examiner's pretensions and reputation, in so many egregious grammatical errors:—but we can not otherwise do justice to the truth. If he will carefully and *candidly* examine the passage he will find that the "verbs are" not "in the present tense!" *(en.)* Was is in the imperfect tense, and *(egennethe)* is in the first aorist pass. & is correctly rendered in the imperfect tense. This he ought frankly to acknowledge upon a review of the subject. In order that this passage may read to suit him, he must add the particle "then" to it. But what error may not be supported from the scriptures in this way? If we may take the liberty to add qualifying words, to limit or extend the sense to our liking: the bible will be like a nose of wax—it will accommodate itself to any thing!

But lest this should not be satisfactory he tries another method: "It would have been good for him had he not have been born at all; that is, had he died in an untimely birth and gone immediately to rest." [Ibid.] But perhaps it might admit of a query whether not being "born at all" is the same thing with having "an untimely birth and going immediately to rest."—Is an untimely birth no birth at all? This is a singular discovery!

He next throws in the following objection: "But to force this passage concerning Judas, to mean that it had have been good for him never to have had an existence, is a severe reflection upon the character of God. If this be its meaning it tells us that God has given an existence which will prove an eternal curse to its possessor." [Ib.] To this we answer: 1. It is by no means *forcing* the passage to put upon it this meaning—it is legitimate and natural. And 2. Many of the gifts of God prove curses to their possessors:—but so long as it is not a necessary consequence, but is owing entirely to the abuses of the

recipients, these are not "reflections upon the character of God." It is indeed a new doctrine, that the Almighty is to be answerable for our turning his grace into lasciviousness—and that it reflects upon his character to say he has given what might have been highly advantageous to its possessor, but what, in consequence of abuse, turns out otherwise!

Again, he says: "If this form of speech prove the endless misery of Judas, similar forms of speech will prove the endless misery of some of the most renowned worthies." After introducing the language of Job. [Chap. iii.] and Jeremiah [Chap. xx.] he concludes: "No one presumes that Job & Jeremiah are the subjects of endless misery," [Ibid.] We have been inclined to consider the hasty & passionate language of Job and Jeremiah, in the places above cited, as the ebulitions of human infirmity. And can our Lord be supposed to have been in the same temper of mind, and under the influence of the same incorrect views, when he uttered these words concerning Judas, as were Job and Jeremiah when fretting against the Lord? How can it be pretended that there is the smallest paralell between the two cases? The many efforts which have been made by Universalist writers to dispose of this passage, by altering the translation—adding to the text—explaining away its force—and perverting its meaning; show most conclusively how fatal it is to their theory!*

The editor next considers Mark ix, 43—48. '—their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched.'

He denies that these words have reference to "an eternal and invisible hell." But the Greek word *Gehenna*, here rendered *hell*, is always used in the New Testament with reference to the place of punishment in the invisible and eternal world. Mr. Kneeland says indeed, that, "the most learned have not proved, neither will they ever attempt to prove, that *Gehenna* in the New Testa-

*In these various shifts, Examiner follows the principal Universalist writers. See Winchester's Dialogues pp. 82—91. The Universalist: In seven letters to Amyntor by Wm. Pitt Smith, PP. 173—176. Minutes of the debate between Messrs. Kneeland and M'Calla pp. 77—93, and M'Calla on Universalism pp. 195—199.

ment, has reference to any other place than the valley of Hinnom." [Lectures pp. 179, 180.] Now we think we are prepared to show to the contrary!—We may not be acquainted with those authors to whom this gentleman would give the character of "most learned:"—but we have consulted those upon this subject, who must be acknowledged to stand *as high* in the republic of letters as any others.

BUXTORF upon this word says: *ponitur pro loco æterni exitii* it is put for the place of eternal destruction.

SCHREVILIUS:—*Locus suppliciorum æternorum* the place of eternal punishment.

HEDERICUS:—*Vallis Hinnom, locus suppliciorum* the valley of Hinnom—or place of punishment.

PARKHURST says: "Gehenna is used in the lxx. for the Heb. *Gy ben Hinnom* Josh. xviii, 16. So Gehenna of the New Testament is in like manner a corruption of the two Hebrew words *Gy a Volley*, and *Hinnom*, the name of a person who was once the possessor of it. This *valley of Hinnom* lay near Jerusalem, and had been the place of those abominable sacrifices in which the idolatrous Jews burned their children alive unto Molock, Baal, or the Sun.

"From this valley having been the scene of those infernal sacrifices, and probably too from its continuing after the time of king Josiah's reformation [2 Kings xxiii, 10.] a place of abominable *filthiness* and *pollution*; [See sense II, below;] the Jews in our saviour's time used the compound word *Gehinnom* for *hell. the place of the damned.** This appears from that word being thus applied by the Chaldee Targums on Ruth ii, 12, Ps, cxl, 12, Isa. xxvi, 15, xxxiii, 14, and by the *Jerusalem* Targum, & that of Jonathan Ben Uziel on Gen, iii. 24, xv, 17.†

*R. David Kimchi in Ps. xxvii, 13, says that Gehinnom was a very contemptible place near Jerusalem, where all manner of filthiness and dead carcasses were cast; and that a continual fire was kept there to burn them: hence the word is used very frequently by the Jewish Rabbins, to signify the place where the wicked are punished after death. (See Dr. Clarke's Note upon the Targum. Cant. viii, 6.)

†The Targum says: "Mighty as hell [*Gehenna*] is the enmity which *the people* bear unto us, and the hatred which

"II. It commonly denotes immediately *hell, the place or state of the damend*, as Mat. v, 29, 30, x, 28. Comp. Mat. xxiii, 15. Jas. iii, 6. And in Mark ix, 43, 44, &c. Our Lord seems to allude to the *worms* which continually preyed on the dead carcasses that were cast out into the *valley of Hinnom, Gehenna*, and to the *perpetual fire* there kept up to consume them. Comp. Ecclus. vii, 17, Judith xvi. 17." *(Greek and English Lexicon.)*

We do not question but the word *Gehenna* alludes to the *valley of Hinnom*, but there are very important marks of difference between them. In the *valley of Hinnom* the *bodies* of men were burned—but in Gehenna their *souls* and bodies. (See Mat. x. 28.) Again in the valley of Hinnam the *worm died* and the *fire was quenched*, but in *Gehenna the worm dieth not* and *the fire is not quenched!* Nor can it be questioned but our Lord alluded to a literal *garden*, when he said to the penitent Thief 'to day shalt thou be with me in *Paradise*. (Luke xxiii, 42.) But who would argue from this that nothing more was intended than that he should be with him in body in a literal *garden?* But this would be quite as consistent and logical, as to say that Christ exhorted his disciples to "fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in" *the valley of Hinnom!*

And how is the *soul* to be *destroyed in the valley of Hinnom?* Mr. Kneeland says: "Because God has power to destroy, it does not necessarily follow that he will. He has power 'of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.' See Mat. iii, 9, but we have no account that he ever did." (Lectures, P. 181. A Note.) The case however which the gentleman brings forward, is a very different one from the case in hand. In this, God's power or *ability* to destroy the soul and body in hell, is urged as a motive for the *fear* of God: but if all that was

---

they have reserved for us, is like the coals of the fire of hell [*Gehenna*] which the Lord created on the second day of the creation of the world, to burn therein those who commit idolatry."

Again, [on Isa. xxxiii, 14.] it says: "The ungodly are judged and delivered into *hell for an eternal burning*"—or "the Gehenna of everlasting fire." [Clarke's Commentary on Isa. *xxx, 33, xxxiii, 14.*]

intended by it was that he was *able* indeed, but *never would do it*, in any case; what impression would this make upon his audience? How would it enforce his subject, any more than to have told them that God was able to bring another flood upon the world;—when he has said that he will no more do it?—Can any one suppose that our Lord in this solemn warning had no meaning at all?—Where the scriptures assert the ability of the Almighty to support and save his people, it is equivalent to a positive promise that he will do it: (See Rom. xi, 23, xiv, 4,) Many instances of this kind might be refered to, but we must not enlarge.*

We must return to the editor for a moment before we dismiss this subject. He labours to prove that the words of Christ in the passage in question "have reference to time & are fulfilled upon the earth," from Isa. lxvi, 23, 24. We shall not deny but the prophet primarily refered to the physical evils which would come upon the disobedient Jews: but allowing that Christ correctly applied his words, we must conclude that they had a further meaning: for he applies them to hell (or *Gehenna)* which we have shown is the place of future and eternal punishments. Instead of explaining the words of Christ by those of the prophet, we explain the words of the prophet by those of Christ; which is the most judicious course of the two, we leave to the candid and intelligent to judge.

The passages to which he refers (Jer. vii, 20, and xvii, 27,) which say that the fire which should be kindled in the gates of Jerusalem *should not be quenched*, imply that it should not be extinguished until it had *utterly consumed* their city:—but is this any evidence that the *fire of hell*, which shall prey upon the soul, shall ever go out? Certainly not, unless the soul is to be literally consumed, or annihilated.

---

*It may be proper to notice that there are two other words rendered hell:—*Hades* and *Tartaruss*. *Hades* most generally signifies the unseen world in general, or seperate state of both the righteous and the wicked; but in some cases, the place of punishment. This word occurs in Mat. xi, 23, xvi, 18, Luke x, 15, Acts ii, 27, 31, 1 Cor. xv, 55, Luke xvi, 23, Rev. i, 18, vi, 8, xx, 13, 14. *Tartaruss* occurs only once in the N. Testament. [2 Pet. ii, 4.]It is used by the heathen poets for the place of punishment, so also by the apostle in this place.

Mr. Ballou supports another construction of the passage in question. He says: "according to the connexions in the 9th of Mark, these words were spoken by Christ to his disciples." And of the *unquenchable fire*, he says, "it is the same no doubt, as described in notes on former parables." By turning back to these "notes on former parables," we learn that "this *unquenchable fire*, is the fire of divine love, which is God himself," & that "the manifest design of this fire, is to save by its purifying qualities the subject on which it operates."—(See Notes upon the parables pp. 18, 35, 37.) So according to this famous expositor, our Saviour would say, 'it is better for thee to enter into life, &c. than to go into God,' or into "the fire of divine love," and be "saved by its purifying qualities."—Rare Divinity!—Query: what *life* can that be which is *better* than to go into God, or into heaven?

The Editor next considers John viii, 21, 'ye shall seek me and shall die in your sins, whither I go ye cannot come.' He thinks that "Jesus did not mean the death of the body in the above passage," and that this "is evident from its connexion and by the manner he uses the term *death*, in this chapter." (P. 185.) But is it a strange thing for the inspired writers to use a term in different senses in the same chapter? Indeed we find the term *death* used in different senses in the same verse!—(See Esek. xviii, 26.) But he says "believers as well as unbelievers must die a temporal death." (Ibid.) Surely!—But not *die in their sins*, it is to be hoped!

Now that the Saviour did not refer to *spiritual death*, is evident from the fact, that those to whom he spake, were then actually *dead* in this sense:—and we cannot suppose that he would have threatened them with what had already come upon them.

Examiner supposes what Christ said to his disciples John xiii, 33, equally implies "their endless misery." (Ibid.) But Christ did not tell his disciples they should *die in their sins!* This is a material circumstance in which the two places differ.

He just glances at the account which our Saviour gives of the rich Man and Lazarus, [Luke xvi,] a part of which we had quoted. As he has "not room to consider" this relation [or *parable*, as he calls it,] "fully," he just gives

us a *clue* to the correct understanding of it. "The great gulph is unbelief and sin."—Indeed! Then it would seem that 'they which would pass over *unbelief and sin, to faith and holiness* 'cannot,' and *vice versa!*—And, cannot sinners believe if they will? Why then must they be 'condemned because they have not believed?'—"But" continues he, "when God shall finish transgression and make an end of sin—when death the last enemy shall be destroyed, then deliverance from the state which these passages describe will be wrought." [Ibid.] Ah! And cannot the sinner pass "unbelief and sin," till "death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed?" Surely then our good editor labours for the reformation of mankind in vain! Should he hereafter exhort his hearers to *believe* & *reform*, they will probably answer him: 'Not quite yet sir: 'they who would pass' the 'gulph' of unbelief and sin, 'cannot' "until death the last enemy shall be destroyed," *then* every difficulty will be removed—the 'great gulph' will be *dried* up—or a *bridge* will be flung over it—or some other expedient will be found out by which all will be able to pass at once'!!!

He finally slightly notices Jas. ii, 13, 'For he shall have judgment without mercy that hath showed no mercy.' Without attempting an explanation of this passage, he proceeds to ask "Do God's judgments extend beyond his mercy, or his mercy beyond his judgments? Is his anger omnipotent over his love, or his love over his anger?" [Ibid.] Each of the Divine attributes occupies its appropriate place in the Divine Administration. It will not answer to exalt one to the expense of the other. If the good of the universe requires, that the finally impenitent should be eternally punished, it would not only be consistent with the goodness of God to inflict such punishment, but his goodness as the moral governor, would absolutely require it.

The gentleman adds: "Jehovah after having pronounced by the prophet Zephaniah as severe judgments as the scriptures contain, turns in mercy to the same people saying, 'the Lord hath taken away thy judgment.'" [Ib.] The judgments pronounced by the prophet were the captivity and dispersion of the Jewish nation:—*Taking away their judgment*, refers to their restoration to their land.—

That these are as "severe judgments as the scriptures contain," we deny,—and ask him to make it appear.

Now *mercy* is the source of human salvation: But in the passage in question a case is stated in which *judgment* shall be exercised *without mercy*:—Consequently in this case there can be no salvation. Let our opponent *fairly* meet this argument.

No. X.—*The argument deduced from the limitation of the day of grace to this life,* DEFENDED.

We come now to the support of our 4th and last argument. This is founded upon "those passages which imply that a change of heart and a preparation for heaven are confined to this life."

The first passage cited under this head, is Isa. lv, 6, 'Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near.' Upon this it was remarked that 'there will be no successful calling upon the Lord after a certain period; and consequently no salvation.' The Editor attempts to avoid this conclusion as follows:—"The reader by reading from this verse through the chapter, will learn that this call will prove effectual.—'So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it.' v. 11. If it is God's pleasure that all shall return, it will be accomplished; for it 'shall not return unto me void but shall accomplish that which I please.'" (P. 186.) A little attention to this passage will enable us most clearly to see, that it is by no means to the Gentleman's purpose. In his application of it be *begs the question*:—he assumes that it is *God's pleasure* that all should be saved *unconditionally*, and that the word of God is *sent* to accomplish this purpose. This we deny; and until it is proved, the passage does in no wise serve his cause.

But if we were to admit the passage in an *absolute* sense, it is still consistent with our views of the 6th verse. For

where the gospel is faithfully promulgated—its doctrines plainly stated—its duties strongly enforced—its promises and its penalties clearly set forth:—So that the wicked are alarmed—those who repent and believe are justified—& the faithful are strengthened and encouraged—it does not *return unto him void;*—it *accomplishes that which he pleases:*—He *pleases* that his word should make a clear and full exhibition of his character and perfections:—and that the plan of salvation, should be so unfolded as to enable all those who will, to come to him & be saved; & that all others should be left without excuse. All this is done, and still the servants of God in all ages exclaim: "Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed." Many do not profit "the word not being mixed with faith."—Hearing as it were "by the way side," or "on stony ground," they do not bring forth fruit. Now will the editor deny these facts—contradict the passage which he has brought forward—or give up his explanation of it?—he may choose which side of the alternative he likes the best!

He next remarks upon Prov. i, 24—28. 'Because I have called, and ye have refused.' &c. No remark was made upon this passage, it was left to speak for itself.—What the Editor supposes our views of it, he thinks, "really shocking." (Ibid.) It is *shocking* indeed that man is a subject of so much misery, as he is, under the sun; but it is no less a truth on that account.

He continues: "Then are his tender mercies extinguished indeed—then has his anger at length fully triumphed over his goodness." (Ibid.) This is in the true stile of universalism—a mighty effort to effect the passions! Solomon says: "The sluggard will not plough by reason of the cold, therefore he shall beg in harvest and have nothing." Now according to Examiner, though the sluggard upon some idle pretense, should neglect to plow his field and cast in his seed, until "the summer is over," if he cannot plow and raise a crop then,—or enjoy plenty without using these means at all; "then are God's tender mercies extinguished indeed"! What cause must this gentleman see to complain of the goodness and justice of Providence, because all the *Idlers* in the land do not enjoy plenty:—because supplies do not come up spontaneously *out of* the ground, or rain down from heaven

as did the manna to supply the children of Israel!

He continues in the same stile: "Can we suppose that an unchangeable God who loves all the works of his hands, will finally mock and laugh at the miseries of his creatures?" (Ibid.) His 'laughing at their calamities' &c. we are to understand figuratively. It is intended to show the utter inefficacy of all their efforts when it is *too late.*

Again he says: "But it is not God who is brought to view or represented as speaking in this passage. But it is wisdom personified in the feminine gender." [Ibid.] We will be greatly obliged to the gentleman if he will inform us *who*, or *what* this *wisdom* is. The most natural inference from all that he has said upon this subject, would be, that he believed *wisdom* to be some *malignant being*. (or *principle.*) He says "it is not God,"—that we are not to "suppose that an immutable God will mock and laugh at the miseries of his creatures." The conduct here ascribed to *Wisdom*, would in his view, be very unsuitable in the Divine Being, under any circumstances.—What indeed he would make of *Wisdom* we cannot tell!

We have supposed that *Wisdom* personified in the book of Proverbs, is the Wisdom, or council of God:—that it embraces the different modes of divine instruction: and that it is precisely the same as if every thing said of Wisdom, were said of God himself. Its being "personified in the feminine gender" is nothing against this view.

He finally adds: "Furthermore if this passage was speaking of 'a change of heart' it does not specify this life as the only time for this change." (PP. 185, 186.) It does however clearly refer to a time when the blessings which are held out in it, cannot be obtained:—other passages give us the most direct information when this time is, which we shall see presently.

He next remarks upon Luke xiii, 24—29. 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate,' &c. Here he amuses himself with what he supposes a contradiction in us. It was remarked upon this passage that 'it is plainly intimated that none will be able to enter in who have not agonized here.' In reply to this remark, he refers to what we had said in another place viz: 'Those who are not in a situation to understand the import of the conditions of salvation, or capable of performing them shall be saved unconditionally.' He then asks, "whether those who are saved un-

conditionally 'agonize here.'" (P. 186.) We supposed that our Lord in the passage under consideration spake with reference to those, *only*, who were 'in a situation to understand the import of conditions—and capable of performing them.' It was only with reference to such that the remark was made, that 'none would be able to enter there who had not agonized here.'—If it be necessary we will now say that we *except all others*. This effort of our friend forcibly reminds us of the old adage, "a drowning man will catch at a straw"!

The next passage which he particularly notices is Heb. xii, 15—17. 'Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God,' &c. Upon this passage it was remarked that '*if we turn away from him who speaketh from heaven*, it will be equally impossible for us to obtain the blessing, as it was for Esau who had sold his birthright.' It is not here said that Esau was *eternally lost*: This is what we would be far from asserting—as we conceive there is no evidence of the fact. But that he *irrecoverably lost his birthright*. Though 'he sought it carefully with tears,' he did not, he could not regain it. Now to make any consistency of what the Apostle says upon this subject, in the passage under consideration, we must suppose him to caution the Hebrew christians against *failing of*, or *losing the grace of God*, as Esau did his birthright, i. e. *irrecoverably*, and so *finding no place for repentance*, though they might *seek it carefully with tears*.

Esau getting a blessing of another kind, affords no grounds to infer as our editor does, that "for those who seem to come short are blessings for future dispensations to unfold." [P. 186.] For this is farther than the Apostle carries the comparison: indeed it would be entirely *contrary* to his obvious design in the comparison. But can the gentleman inform us what "blessings" there are remaining for those who finally "fail of the grace of God?" For our part we can find none!

"Then" [that is, in these "future dispensations,"] says he "all Israel shall be saved." Very true—all the *true Israel*—but he should recollect that 'they are not all Israel which are of Israel.' [Rom. ix, 6.]

He finally comes to the last passage which was introduced under this head. It is Rev. xxii, 11. 'He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and he which is filthy let

him be filty still.' &c. From this it was argued that 'beyond a certain period there shall be no more change of character but every one will have received that impression which will remain forever.' But the editor thinks, "the language of the text does not communicate that idea," for "duration in the text is merely marked by the word *still* which signifies a short or a long period of time, but never an endless duration." (Ibid.) In this he is very much mistaken. If he will take the pains to consult Mr. Walker's or Dr. Johnson's large Dictionary, he will find one sense of the word is, "always, ever, continually." And the word occurs in this sense in the scriptures. [See Ps. lxviii. 21, lxxxiv. 4. Rom. ii, 23.) We by no means contend that this is the exclusive meaning of this word, or that anything could be infered from the word itself, out of its connexions But used as it is in the passage in question with reference to the final state of man, the inference which was drawn from it is perfectly natural and just.

But the editor continues: "This passage—is prophetical of what was near at hand at the time it was communicated. This is evident from its connexions. In the preceding verse it is written 'Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book for the time is at hand.'" [Ibid.] But he should have noticed that this is said as much of the whole book as of this particular part of it. And would he say that all the events predicted in this prophecy were fulfilled near the time in which they were revealed to the beloved Disciple? What we are to understand by the *time* being *at hand*, is, that the time was *near* when these prophecies should *begin* to be *fulfilled*. (See the Continuators of Pool, Benson, and Wesley on the place.) And Mr. Winchester allows the words, 'he that is unjust let him be unjust still,' &c. to be spoken with reference to the time which shall succeed the general Judgment: (See Dialogues P. 188.) but thinks those who are then unjust are to be restored at some subsequent period, and that these words are a kind of irony, like 1 Cor. xiv, 38:—

"But if any man be ignorant let him be ignorant." But it is difficult to see if the unjust are to remain only for a time, until sufficiently humbled, in corrective punishment, and then are to be restored, why they are not rather exhorted to profit by it, and encouraged to hope

for deliverance, instead of being treated ironically!—These words are certainly too serious and portentous for a mere irony! It should also be considered that it is said, 'he that is righteous let him be righteous still.' &c., and would Mr. Winchester say that this is a mere irony?—The cases are exactly parallel, and there is as much evidence of irony in one as the other.

He proceeds: "If it were allowed that the above scriptures limit the day of grace, they by no means indicate that a 'preparation for heaven is confined to the present life.'" (Ibid.) In this we think him mistaken. But as this is an important point we shall here introduce a number of considerations which will contain some additional evidence in favor of the position, that a 'preparation for Heaven is confined to the present life.'

1. We are told in the scriptures that 'now is the accepted time—and day of salvation," and are exhorted 'to day to hear his voice' and not to 'harden our hearts'—and to 'seek the Lord while he may be found and call upon him while he is near.' [See 2 Cor. vi, 2. Heb. iv, 7. Isa. lv, 6.] From these scriptures we infer that this is the *day of grace*, or *salvation*;—but a time will come, when, if we shall have hardened our hearts, the Lord will not be found:—That will not be *the day of salvation*, but *the day of retribution*.

2. The shortness and uncertainty of human life are urged as a reason why we should attend to the business of securing an interest in Christ. [See Luke xii, 35—48. 1 Pet. iv, 7. Eccl. ix, 10.] But upon the supposition that the day of grace continues after death these arguments would be without force—for it might be at once replied: if this business is not accomplished in this life, it may be, yea it certainly will be in the life to come!

3. We are expressly told that 'there is no work, nor devise, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither' we go, that 'the night cometh wherein no man can work.' [See Eccl. ix, 10. John ix, 4.] Hence it appears that this *work* cannot be done *after death*. Does not this expressly *limit the day of grace to this life?*—Certainly unless indeed the day of grace will continue, when there is no *work* to be done—no *device* to be invented—no knowledge or wisdom to be exercised by us, in what

our *hand findeth to do!*—The learned Jewish Rabbi Kimchi says: "There is no conversion of the soul after death."

But 4. There is no scripture evidence for an opportunity, *after death*, of obtaining an interest in Christ.—We are no where told that the work that shall remain undone at death, shall be done afterwards. This upon the Restoration hypothesis is altogether unaccountable!

But upon the supposition that the day of grace will continue after death to some unknown period, even to "*ages of ages*," as we cannot be certain that those who remain unsanctified after death, will then be treated essentially different from what they are in this world: As we know not that their agency will then be overruled—that salvation will then be forced upon them contrary to their desire;—and that they will not then have the same unholy opposition to God, and the same power to rebel against him:—it would still be uncertain whether they would so improve their opportunity as to be saved! For anything that appears, it may be as difficult to persuade men to love God and comply with the terms of reconciliation after death as before. Supposing then the day of grace to continue after death, what evidence does it afford of the Universal Restoration?

The editor quotes "one scripture" as entirely decisive in this case: it is Rom. v, 20, 21. "But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound, that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." [See P. 186.] As he has often introduced this passage in this discussion, it will be proper, in this place, to enquire into its true meaning. He has built no particular argument upon it: But Mr. Winchester argues from it thus: "Sin reigned unto death this is certain; so shall grace reign through righteousness, not only so far as to make life possible to all, but certain for all; or else the reign of grace would not be so extensive and powerful as that of sin." [See Winchester's Lectures Vol. II, P. 264.] In answer to this it is urged 1, "That the phrase *grace did more abound* has no reference to numbers; because sin abounded to *all*, and grace could not abound to *more than all*. 2. That the Apostle in the comparison which he draws between Adam and Christ, considers the condem

nation of the one offence, of Adam, as coming upon *all* mankind then in him: and so on the other hand he allows that 'by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.' Here the subjects of condemnation and justification are exactly the same in all respects. But the Apostle does not stop here.—He carries the advantages on the part of Christ beyond the disadvantages on Adam's side of the comparison. For 3. He shows that provision is made for *many offences* 'and not as it was by one that sinned so is the gift, for the judgment was by *one* to condemnation, but the free gift is of *many offences* unto justification. For if by one man's offence, death reigned by one; much more they which received abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.' (Verses 16, 17.) But then the question is, are all mankind the receivers of this *grace* and the gift of righteousness?—For of such only, it is said that *where sin abounded grace did much more abound.* The Universalists say yes; but matter of fact and the word of God say no." (Universal Salvation Refuted pp. 37, 38.)

In his conclusion he pronounces all the evidence which we have produced in favor of eternal punishment, "presumptive" & "equivocal" at the best: for he says, "there is not a term or form of speech applied to misery that is not applied to things which we know come to an end." (P. 186.) Not to say that this is a loose and unguarded statement, made without a due regard to fact;—we would observe; that we have seen in the course of this investigation that the same *terms and forms of speech,* are used with reference to the duration of future punishment, which are ordinarily used with reference to the duration of the happiness of the righteous, the existence of God, &c. The editor then in order to be consistent with himself, ought of course, to conclude, that the evidence of the eternity of happiness, and the eternity of God, is also "equivocal!"

But as it must be acknowledged that the doctrine of eternal misery, if it be true, is of as much importance as that of the eternal happiness of the glorified, he wishes to know, "why the scriptures do not establish it with as much certainty." (Ibid,) We answer they do!—But he quotes Isa. lv, 17, as more "*positive*" than any thing

which can be found for eternal punishment. Mr. Kneeland in debate with Mr. M'Calla challenged him to bring a passage where the same phrase is used in reference to punishment, as is used in this passage in reference to happiness, rendered 'world without end?' And Mr. M'Calla gave him as substantially the same. Ps. ix 5 — "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name forever and ever, or to the eternity of endless duration, or world without end." (See M'Calla on Universalism pp. 276, 277.) But supposing that a phrase could not be found of precisely as many words—just so arranged;—if there be plain and positive testimony that is equivalent, ought not this to satisfy us? Well, this, we contend we have!

Those who have attended to what we have adduced in proof of the doctrine of eternal punishment, and have noticed the difficulty which Examiner has found in getting *round* it, will know how to estimate his assertion that he finds "not a single passage to defend it from the weight of testimony against it." (Ibid.) He has adduced some "testimony against" our doctrine, but when correctly understood, it is at once perceived to possess no "weight" whatever, in his favor or against us!

But he thinks this doctrine one "in which no good being in heaven or in earth can rejoice, or pray for its accomplishment" (Ibid.) And does he rejoice in limited punishment, and pray for its accomplishment? Did Mr. Winchester, Dr. Chauncey, and others, rejoice that some sinners would remain in hell for "ages of ages," and pray that it might be accomplished? We should rather suppose not:—and yet they did not question the truth of this doctrine.

We have now completed our review of the editor's "reply." And though we have considerably transcended the bounds, which we originally proposed to this rejoinder, (particularly in the five latter numbers,) we hope not much of it, will be considered altogether redundant. After having viewed his arguments in their strongest light we are still fully persuaded that *Universalism is altogether indefensible*! But though we still differ from him in sentiment, to his concluding prayer, that "in conducting this controversy, good motives may influence our labours," we most sincerely and heartily respond AMEN.

UNIVERSAL SALVATION

CONSIDERED, &c.

PART III.

A Defence

OF THE FOREGOING REJOINDER.

No. I.—*The nature of Salvation.*

As the editor published five numbers of the rejoinder, he of course must publish something at the same time which would pass for an *answer*. In this part we shall review this answer, and though we must be brief we shall consider every thing which is important to the general argument.

He commences with an incorrect statement thus: "Observer still perseveres in the sentiment that there is no punishment for any sin save for the sin of rejecting the Mediator." [Vol. II. P. 11.] It appears to us altogether unnecessary to explain this point more particularly than we have done. Were we to do so we could not expect to "remove" his "objections," in his view of the subject:—we would however just observe; that he was perfectly aware that we had said, 'all sins unrepented of, will be punished in a future state:'—why he should make the above assertion, with this fact before him, we are unable to say. All that he says upon this point was fully answered before it was written, and of course it is unnecessary to add any thing farther. The remark itself

which has called forth such a flood of words from him was merely explanatory, and though we still consider it appropriate, yet if it were to be given up it would not effect the general argument.

In our remarks upon Examiner's explanation of the similes used by the writer which we reviewed, he thinks we have "really displayed a kind of ingenuity," but that "it would have been more pleasant had it not have been displayed at the expense of good sense." (Ibid.) If we have "displayed ingenuity at the expense of good sense," (though it may perhaps be considered as rather a singular case) we are thinking that it is quite as "pleasant" as to sacrifice "good sense" without "ingenuity"! We shall now see that if Examiner has not done this, he has come very near it. In explaining his friends similies he says: "He asserts salvation only from that punishment consequent on our remaining sinners." (Vol. I, P. 130.) Upon this we observed that 'on his hypothesis we were never in danger of "remaining sinners," of course we were never in danger of 'the punishment consequent upon' it:—this then is a salvation from nothing.' To this he replies: "Universalists believe that Jesus shall save his people from their sins. Now does it consequently follow that it is a salvation from nothing.' " (Vol. II. pp. 11, 12.) It appears to us that the "good sense" which the gentleman ordinarily exercises might have enabled him to see that we were not speaking of his views of salvation in general, but of those which he made his writer express with regard to salvation from the *consequences of sin.*—This being, according to universalism, a salvation from what we were never in danger of is indeed *a salvation from nothing!*

But he continues: "Observation teaches that the children of men are sinners—reason teaches that there is danger of their still remaining sinners." (Ib.) Does "reason teach that the children of men are in danger of remaining sinners?" Then it teaches that the salvation of all men is not absolutely *certain!* For if it were absolutely certain, as Universalists assert, that all will turn from sin and be saved, there would be no danger of any remaining sinners, unless there is danger of an absolute certainty failing, which is a contradiction. If then "reason teaches that" any 'are in danger of remaining sinners,' as Uni-

versalism teaches the contrary, it must be an unreasonable doctrine! Now which side of the dilemma will Examiner take? Acknowledge that the salvation of which he speaks is indeed a salvation from nothing,—or give up the idea that the salvation of all men is certain? He may take his choice.

As to the Universalists holding to a "present salvation," we should be happy to be convinced of the fact: but we have not been able to discover it in their writings. There appears too much indistinctness, not to say incoherency, in their views of a change of heart:—too much of a disposition to confound all real distinction between the characters of the righteous and the wicked, to admit of any such idea. And when we read in the article which we were reviewing, "*when* we are saved from this [sin] we are saved from all punishment, all distress, and evil of every kind," we could perceive no idea either expressed or implied, but what went to identify salvation, in whole and in part, with deliverance from "evil of every kind." Nor do we yet perceive any error in our conclusion, or that we are "in the same condition" at all.

Examiner says: "Observer and all others who believe in endless punishment for sins committed in this life, must acknowledge, either that an eternity of mental sin and alienation go unpunished, or that an eternity of punishment is inflicted on beings after they have become perfectly holy." (Ibid.) Answer: The idea that the sinner is consigned to eternal punishment for sins committed in this life, by no means concludes that "an eternity of mental sin and alienation go unpunished:"—for it must be considered that the sinner is consigned to punishment for his sins, considered in connexion with all their aggravations:—and one of the greatest will be, that he has reduced himself to the necessity of remaining in a state of "mental sin and alienation" eternally. So his being consigned to eternal punishment, is receiving the whole of the punishment which he deserves, for all the sins of his whole existence.

As to the notion which the gentleman seems to have received, that sinners after death will become "perfectly holy," because they cease to commit crimes, we would beg leave to reply to him in the language of a *brother Uni-*

versalist: [*Such* upon the *Restoration* Scheme.] Mr. Hudson in his letters to Mr. Ballou says: "Every man who has committed sin, is a sinner. and will always retain that character, until he repents, If I committed murder ten years ago, I am considered and treated as a murderer at the present day, by him who knows the thoughts and intents of my heart, unless I have repented and reformed. And a man who goes out of the world in the perpetration of such horrid crimes, will be a murderer in a future state, unless it can be proved that he reforms in the instant of death. But you say a man cannot be a sinner when he has ceased sinning. I reply; a murderer confined in a dungeon has not only ceased from murdering, but is in a situation, where, perhaps, he can commit no actual sin. But does this render him holy? Is every wretch to be regarded as a saint, simply because he has no opportunities of pursuing his villanies? The principle you advance proves this, or else it is nothing to your purpose."*

The "Universalists," it seems then "do not believe that the "righteous are endlessly rewarded for their righteousness in this world." (Ibid.) All the attention that this part of their faith (or rather their *unbelief*) will require from us, will be, simply to contrast it with the language of Christ. He says: 'Great is your reward in heaven.' (Mat. v. 12.) Again: 'Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.' (Luke xiv, 14.)

"Neither do they believe in precise alotments of time to punish men; neither do they believe in the manifest absurdity that when he begins to recieve his punishment he ceases to sin. But Universalists believe as we have said before, that sin and misery are inseperably connected as cause and effect." (Ibid.) It is very difficult to ascertain what particular scheme of Universal Salvation Examiner believes. But he must believe that the *misery* which is inflicted as the punishment of sin, is inflicted *after*

---

*We have not had the privilege of consulting Mr. Hudson's work. The above extract is copied from *The Anti-Universalist*—a paper published at Providence, R. I., by Origin Bachelor. This work is peculiarly calculated to expose the errors of Universalism, and well worthy of liberal public patronage. [See Vol. II. No. 9.]

the sin is committed:—for we know of no "rules of jurisprudence," which limit the punishment of a crime to the time of its commission. But if the punishment of sin succeeds the sin which it punishes, no matter how soon; as he does not believe in exoneration from punishment, nor "in the manifest absurdity that when he [the sinner] begins to receive his punishment he ceases to sin:" at every stage of the sinners punishment, he lays a foundation for still further punishment, and so he must continue to be punished forever, or the sins which he commits during the last stage of his punishment must go unpunished! These are some of the serious "difficulties under which the system of" Examiner "is struggling"!

We shall now proceed to notice what he has said in reply to the objection that his system does away the idea of *pardon.*

In an important particular he appears to have altogether misapprehended us. In replying to him we observed: 'All that is necessary for us to make out is, that the punishment inflicted, is all that the justice of God and his law require: and this our editor will not deny.' Now what we intended was simply, that the punishment inflicted, is all the *punishmont* that the justice of God required should be *inflicted.* Not as he seems *seriously* to suppose, that the justice of God requires *nothing but punishment*—not even *obedience and love!* From this blunder of his own, he draws sweeping consequences—arraigns our *candor*, &c. &c. [See pp. 12, 13.]

Our argument upon this point is this: If the sinner receive all the punishment which he deserves, or justice requires, as the editor asserts:—As pardon implies *a gracious exoneration from deserved punishment;*—the idea of pardon would be totally inconsistent with his theory.

But he maintains that punishment does not "satisfy the divine law," and of course, he thinks, sin must still be forgiven, after it has received all its punishment.—(Ibid.) The controversy upon this point then, seems at last to turn upon the proper idea of the *pardon of sin.* He, according to his reasoning, supposes it to consist, in the act of dispensing with the sinners obedience, after he has received all the punishment which he deserves. If this be the true notion of pardon, then indeed may his views of punishment be consistent with that doctrine. But by

what authority is this definition of *pardon* supported? Surely not by any of our english standards, or by general usage! Universalists must use the word *pardon* in a sense entirely peculiar to themselves. It is commonly understood to imply *the remission of a penalty—exoneration from punishment*: in this sense we understood it when we urged that it was inconsistent with our opponents notions of punishment. This we now maintain is the correct notion of the pardon of sin, and the consequence which we first drew from it, we do honestly think perfectly legitimate.

He finds much fault with the translation of Isa: xl. 2, which we gave from several learned critics. He says it "is so manifest a pervertion that but very little need be said to make it appear." (P. 13.) Not to insist that Vatablus, Vitringa, Bp. Lowth and Dr. Clarke, are entitled to, at least, as much confidence, in matters of sacred criticism, as Examiner:—and that what he says appears a little too highly seasoned with arrogance:—we will attend to his reasons. He says: "By adding words not found in the original text, and by altering the *tense* of verbs, they have endeavored to shield their beloved doctrine from the deluge with which this passage sweeps it." (Ibid.) If the translation be allowed to be somewhat paraphrastic, as it is supported by the best reasons, and the original 'will very well bear' such a rendering, it cannot be proved "a manifest pervertion". As to "altering the tense of verbs," it may be observed: that whether the verbs be rendered in the past or future tense, the case is precisely the same as to the question in hand. And it cannot be denied but that the prophet refered to events then in *futurity*, though as is very common in the glowing stile of the prophets, they are spoken of as though they had already taken place. Hence changing the tense of the verbs from the past to the future, can have no effect upon the doctrine of the passage. Indeed the Universalist writers make more use of this circumstance in the prophetic writings than any other! Mr. Winchester upon John vi. 37—39, says: "As to the small variation of the words from *given, to giveth*, of which some would fain take advantage:—it is nothing to the purpose;—for as the sense is perfectly the same; and differs only in the timing of the verb. it shows the weakness of the cause, which depends upon such criticisms." [See Winchester's Lectures,

Vol. II. P. 260.) So by a little attention to the subject, and a little of Mr. Winchester's help. we are saved from being *engulphed* in the "deluge" of Examiner's *sweeping conclusions!*

The argument from a number of passages of scripture, which we informed him he had not noticed: he thinks "sufficiently embraced in" his "answer." (Ibid.) But we still say that he has not noticed it. What he has said upon some of these passages, in another connexion, is totally irrelevant.

Our argument from Ps. ciii, 10—12, the editor does not attempt properly to meet, or show that it is not fairly deduced from the passage. He disposes of it. by setting in opposition to it, a number of passages which assert, that God will reward every man according to his works. But there is not the least contradiction between these passages and the one in question. They do not assert that all men receive the whole of their reward as they go along—in this world. If they *ultimately* receive it, all that these scriptures assert will be literally verified. And that these passages must be refered to the future world for their accomplishment we shall now proceed to prove.*

1. The scriptures clearly assert that rewards & punishments are not equally distributed in this life. This David fully asserts in the lxxiii Ps. He saw the wicked in great power and prosperity; not in trouble as other men —pride compassing them about as a chain—violence covering them as a garment—their eyes standing out with fatness—having more than heart could wish. And not at first reflecting upon the punishment that was reserved for them in another world; he began to be 'envious at the foolish,' &c. and says: 'Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain and washed my hands in innocensy—for all the day long have I been plagued and chastened every morn-

*2 Chron. vi, 30; is perhaps an exception. What Solomon meant by praying that the Lord would render unto every man according to all his way,' &c., was 'that he would restore the captive Israelites upon their repentence. We do not deny but that the favours which God confers upon the obedient, and the miseries which he inflicts upon the disobedient, in this world may *in some sense* be considered as rewarding them according to their works—but *not in* the *full* and proper sense.

ing:'—But going into the sanctuary of God, he understood their *end!* 'Surely' says he 'thou didst set them in slippery places, thou castest them down as in a moment'!!—To us it seems totally impossible to make either consistency, or good, of this Ps. upon the supposition that all men are rewarded and punished according to their works as they go along.

Again Solomon says: 'There is a vanity which is done upon the earth; that there be just men unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked; again there be wicked men to whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous.' (Eccl. viii, 14.) So David and Solomon, both, had facts before them, which went plainly to say that this present state is not a state of rewards and punishments.

But 2. We are taught in the scriptures, that in the next life an equal distribution of rewards & punishments, will be administered. Christ says: 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels: and then shall he reward every man according to his works.' (Mat. xvi, 27.) We have before shown that this passage must refer to the second coming of Christ—nothing need here be added on that point: & if so, it goes conclusively to establish our proposition. St. Paul says: 'For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad.' (2 Cor. v, 10 See also; Acts xvii, 31. 2 Tim. iv, 1. 2 Pet. iii, 7, and 2 Thes. i, 7—10.) And that this judgment will take place after death, in the future world, is explicitly asserted:—for St. Paul says: 'And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment.' (Heb. ix. 27. See also Rev. xx, 11—15.)

"Indeed" says an able Theologian: "The very idea of a general judgment, decides this question without farther argument. Of what use are a trial and a judgment, after the whole penalty of the law has been inflicted on the criminal? None It is the perfection of absurdity to talk of such a judgment. This is so evident that attempts have been made of late, to do away the idea of a general judgment altogether, attempts that I need not now meet, for they were fairly met and put down by an abler hand, (the Rev. T. Merritt,) at the first onset. And indeed, this

new idea of no judgment is so directly opposed to many of the plainest passages of scripture, that with an enlightened public, who have their bibles before them, it hardly needs a refutation. And as the reality of a general judgment, the scriptures being true, cannot be reasonably doubted. So neither can it be doubted that men receive rewards and punishments in a future world."*

Trusting then that we have clearly established the principle, that it is not in this world, but in the world to come, that men are rewarded according to their works; the passages which Examiner brings forward must be refered to the future world for their accomplishment, consequently they can prove nothing to his purpose.

No. II.—*The design of punishment, &c.*

In his reply to the second number of the rejoinder the editor is unusually brief. Perhaps for the sake of brevity, or for *some other reason*, he has passed the most important part of that number without notice.

What he says upon exemplary punishment is mere declamation. But *pathetic effusions* do not have the force of arguments with us:—indeed we consider them untimely when a point is to be *established*. and in general, to indicate the entire want of *argument*. But this is the strong hold of the Universalists, and we must not deprive them of the advantage of it altogether!

As to God's acting "in two characters," we would observe, that this is a form of expression which he has coined for us. We did indeed suffer it to pass, under certain qualifications. We said: 'He now offers salvation,—he will then punish for rejecting his offers.' This is our

*See a Discourse upon future rewards and punishments by the Rev. Wilber Fisk, A. M. This discourse, with the authors defence of it in answer to Mr. Pickering—and the Rev. T. Meritts discourse, (to which reference is made in the above extract,) together, constitute an able refutation of modern Universalism. (See the Discourses in Methodist Mag. Vol. VI.)

doctrine: and he may say it makes God act in two characters, or any thing else which suits him, as long as the doctrine is defensible. But we would deny that it holds up God as acting in opposite *moral* characters: Changing from *good* to *bad*—from *merciful* to *malignant*.—The character and perfections of God, as the moral governor, are *ever the same*.

He insists that this view makes God *changeable*. (Ibid.) But we are not able to see how the Lord's treating moral agents *differently*, under *different* circumstances, makes him *changeable*. For instance: The Lord confers his favors upon the inhabitants of A. and exercises his displeasure against the inhabitants of B: Now if the inhabitants of A. remove to B. they would be the objects of the divine displeasure; and that without any change in God:—the change which takes place in their circumstances requires *different* treatment, but this argues no change in God.

The gentleman's retort upon us, with regard to knowing the "secrets of eternity," [Ibid.] he will perceive is not just; upon reflecting that we did not assume to decide any thing *positively*, any farther, than the fact, which we supposed was revealed.

The question at issue between us is, whether punishment in all cases is designed to reform the subject. He asserts that it is. [Vol. I. P. 132.] But we would ask him whether the punishment of the Antideluvians—the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrow—the Egyptians in the red sea—of the murmuring Israelites, &c. &c. &c. —was designed to reform them and make them obedient subjects? If not what becomes of this main pillar of his system?

Dr. Huntington says: "The utmost torment, for a long period even for *ages of ages*, could have no more effect in humbling sinners of the human, than of the angelic nature. The devils are no better for their long continued anguish and pain. Afflictions in this world, do not make sinners any better; but are invariably, only on occasion of their growing worse and worse, if the special almighty energy of the spirit does not attend them. There is not the least intimation of the operation of the spirit of God, or of any means of grace in hell; in whatever sense any understand that awful state.—The devils have been under these personal sufferings, for a long time.

and are no more humble than ever, no more fit for heaven. And had it been the decree of God that all mankind should be there in person with them, ever so long. they would grow worse and worse, through all ages of ages; for aught that their intolerable torments would do for them." (Calvinism Improved, pp. 206. 207.) This is another instance in which this Universalist writer levels a blow at the root of the system as held by Examiner. As this is a point upon which much depends in this controversy we will add a number of arguments from Dr. Edwards: "All those texts which speak of the divine *vengeance, fury, wrath, indignation, fiery* indignation, &c. hold forth some other punishment, than that which is merely disciplinary.*

"That the passages now quoted, do indeed speak of a punishment more than merely disciplinary, is manifest by the very terms of the passages themselves. To say that *vengeance, wrath, fury, indignation, fiery indignation, wrath without mixture,*" *and destruction without remedy,* "mean a mere wholesome fatherly, discipline for the good only of the subjects, is to say that the inspired writers were grossly ignorant of language.

"The same may be argued from various other passages of scripture, some of which I shall now cite.†

"By all these texts it appears, that some will suffer the *curse of God.* A *curse* is undoubtedly a punishment which does not promote the good of the subject: otherwise a *curse* and a *blessing* are perfectly confounded. If it shall still be insisted, that the *curse* so often mentioned, means that punishment only, which is conducive to the good of the subject: it may be answered, then there would be no impropriety in calling the present afflictions of the real disciples of Christ, by the name of a *curse.* Why then are they not so called in scripture? And why are

*See Deut. xxxii, 41, Rom. iii, 5, 6, xii, 19, Luke xxi, 22, 2 Thes. i, 8, Jude 7, Job xx, 23, Isa. li, 17, lix, 18, Rom. ii, 8, 9, Heb. x, 27. See also, Ps. l, 22, Heb. xii, 29, Luke xii, 46, Rev. xiv, 10, and Prov. xxix, 1.

†See 1 Cor. xvi, 22, Deut. xxvii, 26. xxix, 19, xi, 26—29 Prov. iii, 33, Job. xxiv, 18, Ps. xxxvii, 22, cxix, 21, Jer. xi, 3, xvii, 5, Mat. 1, 14, iii, 9, 2 Pet, ii, 14.

not the *curses* of the wicked, as well as the *afflictions* of the righteous, said to work together for their good, and to work out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory?

"I beseech the reader to consider what a contrast there is between the texts, which have now been quoted, and those in which a punishment really disciplinary is mentioned and described. In the former the punishment is called by the names of *vengeance, fury, wrath, smoking wrath, fiery indignation, wrath without mixture,*" *destruction without remedy, "a curse, an anathema, all the curses of the law, &c.* Whereas the real discipline of God's children is called a *chastisement;* 'If ye be without chastisement, then are ye bastards and not sons:' a *correction;* 'I will correct thee in measure and will not leave thee altogether unpunished.' This correction is said to be *mingled with pity.* 'Like as a father pitieth his children so the Lord pitifieth them that fear him'—'I will visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes, nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him.' But where in all the scriptures is the punishment of the future state represented to be designed for the good of the subjects? Where is it in scripture called a fatherly chastisement, correction, a discipline, or by any other appellation of the like import? What right then have we to consider it as a mere chastisement? Is not this an idea formed in the fond imagination of those who would fain support a favorite system?

"The scripture, so far from declaring those who suffer chastisement and disciplinary pains, *accursed* merely on that account, expressly declares them *blessed.* [Ps xciv, 12. Heb. xii, 5, 9.] If therefore the damned suffer a mere chastisement from the hand of God, they are not *accursed,* but are the blessed sons or children of God."

Finally: "If the punishment of hell be a mere wholesome discipline, then what the apostle says of the discipline of christians in this life, may be said with equal truth and propriety of the punishment of the damned: thus, we glory in damnation; knowing that damnation worketh repentance, and repentance salvation!" [See Edwards against Chauncy, pp. 53—70.]

Examiner thinks that "it is obvious that the reason assigned for Adam's return to the dust was not that he had

eaten of the forbidden fruit, but because" he was 'taken out of it.' [Vol ii. P. 33,] If then the circumstance of his having been taken out of the ground, is mentioned as the reason of his returning to the dust, it is equally the reason of all the evils spoken of in the connexion:—and if all these evils are the natural effect of this cause, and not the penalty of the law, where will he find the "sentence" of which he has spoken? We think it is not to be found!

As in many other particulars, so in denying that temporal death is the consequence of sin, Examiner follows Mr. Ballou, and some other modern Universalist writers. Mr. B. says: "If man was not mortal before transgression, he must have been *immortal*; if he was *immortal* he was not subject to change, but remains in the same *immortal* state." [Treatise on Atonement, P. 36.] This profound man, in the greatness of his wisdom, confounds *immortality* with *immutability*! We never dreampt that the human body was *immortal* in the sense in which he uses the term. But what we contend for, is this: that had man have retained his rectitude, he would have been exempt from temporal death, as from all other evils.—Whether this exemption would have been the effect of some law of nature, or of the immediate support of the Author of his existence, is of no particular importance to the argument, the fact itself is all we contend for.

Mr. Drew forcibly argues this point from the immutability of God, thus: "The same moral causes which exist when the body is destroyed" [upon the supposition of its being destroyed without sin,] "must have been in existence when it was created; because God is necessarily immutable, and the creature is presumed to have undergone no change. If, therefore, under these given circumstances the body could have been destroyed, we must presume, either that creation and dissolution are the same thing, or that two opposite effects have resulted from the same cause. To suppose the former we are forbidden by fact, and to suppose the latter is a contradiction. The final result must therefore be, that the human body must have been immortal. And hence also, since this theory and present fact are at variance with each other, the dissolution which the human body undergoes, must be attributed to some other cause; a cause distinct from any which has hitherto been explored; a cause

which did not then reside in man, and which could not at any period whatsoever reside in God." [See Treatise on the Resurrection, P. 15.]

A respectable class of the Universalist writers agree with us upon this point. Dr. Huntington upon Gen. ii. 17. says: "I believe the more common construction of this commination, by protestant divines is right, viz: that total death, temporal and spiritual was to take place on all human nature on that very day. In the day thou eatest of the forbidden fruit, thou shalt become mortal, even thou Adam and all human nature with thee. Thy soul also shall sustain great damage and unhappiness, that is, spiritual death, in some awful degree, without the least ground of hope that the case shall ever become any better with thee." (Calvinism Improved, P. 29.)

Mr. Winchester says: "The sentence of death was pronounced, even the death of the body, in these words—'dust thou art,'" &c., and allows expressly that our "bodies die in consequence of sin." (See Dialogues pp. 125, 126.) So, "obvious" as Examiner thinks it is, that temporal death constituted no part of the penalty of the law, these two *Universalist* writers, think that the contrary is quite "obvious!" We will now leave him to settle this difference with his own authors!

He thinks according to our theory "it would take *three eternities* to punish men according to what strict justice demands: *one* for original sin, *another* for actual sins, and a *third* 'for rejecting his glorious offers.'" (P. 33.) We would just beg the gentleman to recollect that we have all along said that we are not exposed to eternal death for the original offence, and that rejecting the offers of mercy, is *actual sin* and nothing else. From what then, but *actual transgression* have we directly, or indirectly, argued that justice demands eternal punishment?

His *retort* is of course ineffectual.—And when he said that "the first created pair—could not stand by their own strength," if he meant they were not "independent of God," we have no difference with him upon this point.—But if we have understood him, he supposes that the fall of man was a necessary consequnce of his being placed in a *state of probation*. In this we differ with him, and still

insist. that there could be no justice in condemning men, upon this principle.

We have made no "attempt to support the old proverb 'the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge.'" (Ibid.) Why must our views be misrepresented in order to be successfully opposed? If it is not because they are invulnerable in their legitimate form, we know not the reason!

"It is difficult" it seems, for him to "conceive how that 'all have sinned in Adam,' before they were capable of moral action." (Ibid.) It would perhaps be as difficult for him to conceive how Levi paid tythes in Abram, before he was capable of any action! (See Heb. vii, 9) But what is meant by our sinning in Adam, is our being involved in the consequences of his sin: can he not conceive how this can be? But as the doctrine of original sin is not directly embraced in our design, we shall not dwell at length upon the evidence by which it is supported.

The arguments which we drew from several passages, to establish the doctrine of man's being restored to a state of *initial salvation*, stand like the beaten anvil to the stroke, against the *wordy* warfare which he has waged against them. He first met these arguments with great courage and exerted his powers at reasoning and *criticism* to answer them. But since our defence, he passes over them as lightly as possible! Indeed in the gentleman's second effort, there is little beside witicisms—erroneous statements—and evasions!!

No. III.—*The Atonement.*

The editor commences his "reply" to our number on Atonement, with a bitter complaint of misrepresentation. We think however that no great exertions will be necessary to show that his charge is altogether unjust.

The question at issue, is, how is the justice of God satisfied for sin? He says, by every man being brought "to the requirements of the law." (See Vol. I. P. 129.) Now as there is no dispute between us whether the jus-

tice of God is satisfied with obedience. for the time being: the only question being how the law and justice are satisfied for sin, or 'for past failures:' And he said, that justice would be satisfied when all men are brought to 'the requirements of the law: It appeared to us, with the evidence of demonstration, that on his system, 'subsequent obedience makes ample amends for past transgressions,' and that 'pardon and grace' are altogether superceded. But this, he thinks is misrepresenting him, because he had said in another place; "Neither can future obedience satisfy for past disobedience." He should however recollect that what we said was a deduction from his premises, and not a statement of what he had asserted as his belief! If he does not receive the conclusion which we drew from his premises, he should show, that it does not naturally flow from them. He then might say we had reasoned incorrectly, or unfairly; but this itself would not substantiate the charge of misrepresentation. If he sees proper to lay down premises in one place, and disclaim the doctrine which necessarily flows from them, in another, and thus contradict himself, it is not our concern! He may reject the natural and necessary consequences of his theory, and yet retain the theory itself, if he choose; but he must not be offended, if we continue to assert these consequences legitimate, until he shews them to be otherwise.

We might in our turn complain of misrepresentation.—We know not what grounds he had to represent, as our faith, that "Divine justice requires endless misery in addition to perfect obedience!" (P. 52.) For surely such a notion has no more relation to any part of our system, than has the doctrine of transmigration!! Nothing need be said upon the various remarks which he has made, upon what he has thus erroneously attributed to us. We will leave him to enjoy all the happiness possible, in spending his energies upon a mere *man of straw!!*

The gentleman accepts the invitation which we gave him, to prove that 'Christ will in fact make all men obedient.' (Ibid.) He first adduces as proof of this, John i, 29, 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.' We suppose that he would assume that *taking away the sin of the world*, means *making all men obedient*. This will not be granted:—but it will be main-

tained on the other hand, that it implies: So making an atonement for sin, as that the penitent and believing may be saved:—or placing *all men* in a state of *salvability*.

His next proof is Col. i, 10. 'For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell: and having made peace thro' the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself;—whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.' If we should admit that *all things*, &c. include all mankind, it is true that it *pleased* the Father to reconcile all, as it would have *pleased* him not to give Ephraim up: (Hosea ii, 8.) Or as it would *please* him that the sinner should not die: (Esek. xxxiii, 11.) That is, it would *please* him *on the terms of the gospel* to reconcile all men, &c. That this is the true sense is evident from the 22 and 23 verses. Here their being *presented* holy, &c. is suspended upon the condition of their *continuing in the faith*. So the very thing which Examiner brought this passage to prove *certain*, is in the connexion left *hypothetical!*

It seems that he supposed us to hold the doctrine of absolute imputation and substitution, because "the writer" we 'first took up on this point was writing against it!' We will now apprize him, that we never undertook to defend all that he was "writing against:" We sufficiently qualified our views upon this subject in the outset.

It seems difficult for him to understand what we meant by 'public justice.' Thus he proceeds: "Has public justice a requirement? if it has, does it require so much punishment as the justice of God, which according to Observer is endless punishment? if it does then Christ suffered to the amount or according to this justice." (Ibid.) "The word justice" says Dr. Edwards, "is used in three different senses. Sometimes it means *commutative* justice, sometimes *distributive*, and sometimes *general* or *public* justice. *Commutative* justice respects property only, and the equal exchange and restitution of it. *Distributive* justice is the equal distribution of rewards and punishments, and it respects the *personal* rights and demerit of the person rewarded or punished. *General* or *public* justice respects what are called the rights of a community, whether a city, state, empire, or the universe.—This kind of justice requires the public good; and when-

er that is violated, or neglected, the public is *injured.* (Edwards against Chauncy, pp. 80, 81.)

Public justice then, as we have used the phrase, is *the justice of God in relation to the universe.* As a due reverence for the moral Governor,—a respect for his laws,—a detestation to sin,—and a dread of its fatal consequences, are necessary to the general happiness: and as these objects would be best answered by some public expression of the hatred which God bears to sin: public justice required this expression, before pardon was extended: It is in this sense we conceive that Christ *satisfied Divine justice.* Dr. Magee says: "God's displeasure against sin is such, that he has ordained, that the sinner shall not be admitted to reconciliation and favor, but in virtue of that great sacrifice, which has been offered for the sins of men, exemplifying the desert of guilt, and manifesting God's righteous abhorrence of those sins, which required so severe a condition of their forgiveness." (See Magee on Atonement, Vol. I, P. 362.)

The editor concludes, that "there can be no difference between us," upon that part of the liii of Isa. which we brought forward in opposition to him, "unless" we "should contend that the *highest* sense in which the above prophecy is fulfilled bears no analogy to the *lower.*" (P. 35.) We should be happy to find that there is no difference between Examiner's views of this important subject and our's. But though, it seems, "we both believe in the *lower* and *higher* sense" of the prophet's words, it will still be a question between us. *how* Christ *bore our sins*—and *how* he *delivers us from them.* If he adhere to the ground which he has taken, we cannot expect that he will concede, that this is effected by *making an atonement for sin,* in any proper sense: and while this is the case we cannot be reconciled! We are by no means "so fond of disputation as to argue against" him "on points in which we are agreed." (Ibid.) But while we have no evidence that he differs, in his views of the atonement, from Dr. Priestly, Mr. Ballou, and Mr. Kneeland, we shall continue to think that there is a wide difference between us, his suggestions to the contrary notwithstanding!

No. IV.—*Conditions.*

Upon the subject which we shall resume in this number, the editor appears altogether confused. And as he has mistaken the point at almost every step, we shall have but little to do but to set him right.

His first effort is to reconcile the contradictory grounds which he had taken upon the subject. He says: "We agreed with what Observer said on this point from the fact that he had just before given us to understand that what he called conditions was wrought in man by the Holy Spirit." (Vol. II, P. 75.) Well, if he agreed with us under such an impression, we know not how he received it;—for we never intended to give him to understand any such thing. But he now quotes from us what we said of the officers of the Holy Spirit (See this work P. 21,) And upon our words observes: "We could derive no idea from the above than that the gracious work to be accomplished by the Holy Spirit, was the conviction, conversion, and sanctification of Man." (Ibid.) Very good —this is precisely what we intended. But he continues: "And as Observer was pleased to call this gracious work to be accomplished by the efficient means provided, conditions, we did not feel disposed to enter into a war of words with him on the subject." (Ibid.) Here he is wrong again:—We have not called "this gracious work conditions."—We held forth '*repentance* and *faith*' as the *conditions* of salvation; and 'the gracious work,' of which we spake, which we asserted to be performed by the Holy Ghost, we considered as salvation itself. How the gentleman has received the impression that we, with himself, confound salvation with the conditions upon which it is suspended, we are unable to divine, for we have in every instance carefully distinguished them!

The gentleman continues his *examination* thus: "If there is any difference between us on this subject, the difference is as follows. We believe that conviction, repentance, &c., are wrought in the soul through the influence of the spirit of God—Observer believes they are not, or else we are agreed." (Ibid.) Not altogether so: He has here jumbled together things which are entirely different! *Conviction* we allow is wholy wrought by the Holy Spirit: So far, "we are agreed." Repentance is

indeed the consequence of Divine influence, and cannot exist without it:—But so far as it involves the exercise of our moral powers, it cannot be performed by the Holy Spirit.

The editor goes on: "What his real belief is, on this point, or whether he has a steady belief, is difficult to decide. From his various statements, the conclusion would sometimes be drawn, that the work of grace in the heart is performed by God; other times, that this work is performed by man, and at others, that part is of God and part of man." [Ibid.] Another instance of his great accuracy!—As to "the work of grace in the heart" we have never intimated, that "it is performed by man."—but the *conditions* which are required of man are very different from "the work of grace in the heart!" The gentleman must be in as great difficulties to comprehend the scripture representation of this subject, as the one we have given. Here we are told that 'salvation is of the Lord:' [Jonah ii, 9.] And yet are required to save ourselves. [Acts ii, 40, 1 Tim. iv, 16.] The Lord promised by the prophet to 'give a new heart and a new spirit:' [Esek. xxxvi, 26, xi, 19.] But again he says, 'make yourselves a new heart and a new spirit.' [xviii. 31.] And St. Paul as though this work were "part of God and part of men." exhorts the Phillipians thus: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.' [Phil. ii, 12, 13.] Now what will he make of all this? Must it not be a matter of doubt with him, whether the sacred Writers have any "steady belief on this point" or not? When from their "various statements the conclusion would sometimes be drawn that the work of grace—is performed by God: other times, that this work is performed by man, and at others, that part is of God and part of man!"—Upon our theory there is no difficulty involved in these representations. One class of these pages recognises the *agency of God* in *the work of grace*:—Another the co-operation of *man's agency*, in the performance of the conditions:—And the third *brings the two together!* So far is the Apostle, from so holding the Divine agency, as to exclude the co-operation of our agency, that he argues the latter from the former. His argument stands thus: *It is God that worketh in you—therefore work out your own salvation.*

As the question whether repentance and faith are the gift of God, or the act of the creature, has embarrassed many minds, we will still detain the reader upon it, while we lay before him a few lucid observations from two eminent divines. Mr Shinn concludes an able investigation of this subject thus: "5. Confining the query to that act, or exercise of the mind in believing, by which we are influenced to do the works of God, and by which we receive the indwelling comforter, properly called gospel faith, we must say either: (1.) That it is an act of the human mind, independent of any influence from above, or (2.) That it is an act of God, producing an effect upon the human mind, without any voluntary act of that mind; or (3.) That it is a voluntary act of the human mind in conjunction with, or aided by, an immediate influence of the Holy Spirit. If we admit the *first*, it will follow that man is able of himself and independent of any spiritual assistance from God, to believe with a faith that justifieth the ungodly, that purifieth the heart, and overcometh the World. This contradicts the whole tenor of the gospel. If we admit the *second*, it will follow that faith is no gospel duty enjoined on man, but is as exclusively the act of God, as the creation of the world. I think there is no possible alternative but to admit the *third*, that faith is a voluntary act of the human mind, in conjunction with, or aided by an immediate influence of the Holy Spirit." (SHINN's *essay on the plan of salvation.*)

The profound and ingenious Mr. Fletcher says: "*Faith* is the gift of God to believers, as *sight* is to you. The parent of good gives you the light of the sun, and organs proper to receive it: he places you in a world where that light visits you daily: he apprizes you, that sight is conducive to your safety, pleasure and profit: and every thing around you bids you use your eyes and see: nevertheless you may not only drop your curtains, and extinguish your candle, but close your eyes also. This is exactly the case with regard to faith. Free grace removes (in part) the total blindness, which Adam's fall brought upon us: free grace gently sends us some beams of truth, which is the light of *the Sun of righteousness;* it disposes the eyes of our understanding to see those beams; it excites us various ways to welcome them; it blesses us with many, perhaps with all the means of faith, such as opportuni-

ties to hear, read, inquire; and power to consider, assent, consent, resolve, and re-resolve to believe the truth. But, after all, *believing* is as much our own act as *seeing*. We may, nay, in general do, suspend, or omit the *act* of faith: especially when that act is not yet become *habitual*, and when the glaring light, that *sometimes* accompanies the revelation of the truth, is abated. Nay, we may imitate Pharaoh, Judas, and all reprobates: we may do by the eye of our faith, what some report that Democritus did by his bodily eyes. Being tired of seeing the follies of mankind, to rid himself of that disagreeable sight he put his eyes out. We may be so averse from *the light, which lightens every man that comes into the world;* we may so dread it because our works are evil, as to exemplify, like the Pharisees, such awful declarations as these: *Their eyes have they closed, lest they should see*, &c. —*Wherefore God gave them up to a reprobate mind*, and *they were blinded.*" (Fletcher's Checks, Vol. II, P. 230.)

Examiner continues: "It is written that the 'goodness of God leadeth to repentance' by which we learn that God is the moving cause of repentance." (Ibid.) In this we fully acquiesce. Again: "Peter also testified that 'him (that is Christ) hath God exalted—to give repentance to Israel.' Thus repentance is a gift." (Ibid.) Christ was exalted to make it possible for us to be saved on the condition of repentance—and to procure the grace necessary to enable us to repent. Hence it is said that he was exalted to *give repentance*. But we are not to suppose that the exercise of repentance is exclusively the work of God, for if so it never could be a duty required of us, any more than to create a new world!

The comparison which we introduced, of a labouring man, he strains beyond the bounds which we set to it.—We did not assert any other point of resemblance between the case and the subject, than the difference which existed between the condition and the benefit. No metaphor will bear in all respects. Indeed by pursuing the course which he has taken in this case, with the parables of Christ they would appear absurd & foolish. Does not the editor see the same absurdity in the parable in which the Saviour represents "the great salvation of God and the conditions upon which it is suspended by a hard days labour and" a '*penny*,' which he sees in our comparison?

This he may see by *candidly* examining that parable!

In remarking upon Acts iii, 25, 26, he insists that, "turning them from their iniquities, Peter calls the blessing." (P. 76.) Though we had given a different explanation of this passage, yet it is by no means important to our argument. We lose nothing at all by allowing his views of it. It will then be a question *how* the Lord *turns* the children of men from their iniquities. We contend that he does it by means adjusted to the freedom of the human mind.

In explaining Heb. viii, 10, 11, we said after Mr. Benson, that the house of Israel referred to the 'spiritual Israel.' But if we yield this point likewise, it will be nothing to our disadvantage. For all that can be claimed, is, that there are no conditions *expressed* in this passage. Were this to be conceded, it would still remain to be made out that they are not *implied*, and that they are not expressed in any other passage, and this will not be done.

He thinks we have "placed so much on man's independent agency as makes him capable of damning or saving himself." (Ibid.) We hold to no "independent agency" in man. He is "capable of damning himself" indeed, but not of "saving himself!"

In remarking upon the use which we made of the Apostle's reproof 'Nay but O man who art thou that repliest against God,' &c., he thinks to alarm us by associating us with *calvinists*. He says: "both Observer and Calvinists are equally strenuous for the endless damnation of sinners, and all the difference that we can discern between them, is, they want sinners damned in their own way." [Ibid.] Yea, just as much as Examiner *wants them damned in his way!!* He continues: "For our part we cannot see how it is any better to be endlessly miserable according to the doctrine of Observer, than according to the doctrie of Calvinists." [Ibid.] We do not suppose it will be "any better" for the sinner, i. e. any more tolerable:—Whether it will be any more consistent with the Divine perfections, is not necessary to inquire, at this time. If endless punishment is consistent, upon our scheme, it is not necessary for us to enquire, in this investigation, whether it is more consistent, than upon the Calvinistic scheme: Nor shall we, now, enter into any such enquiry.

He [illegible]s that his scheme does not involve the consequence [illegible] will *violate* the agency of man, or act *in*[illegible] his salvation. [P'P. 52, 77.] How then [illegible] all men certain? The great universal[illegible] Chauncy says: "Such exertions of the [illegible] shall be *certainly effectual* to restrain them [illegible] from perverting their faculties, look like, [illegible] *impossibility*, or a method of conducting towards [illegible] agents, which is unfit in the reason of things, as not [illegible] suited to the nature of such kind of beings." [Benevolence of the Deity, P. 219.] Now if "such exertions of the Deity as shall be certainly effectual to restrain free agents from perverting their faculties, is a moral impossibility," how can it be certain that all will improve their faculties and be saved? But perhaps Examiner will take up some different theory of human liberty—as to this, we are not certain, for he has not specifically laid down his views of this subject.

The whole of his evidence for *unconditional salvation* is nothing but negative evidence, and is entirely without force! The scriptures and arguments which we brought forward, he has not attempted to answer: Should he resume the subject, we invite him to this task; and when it shall be completed, if he will bring one passage of scripture which goes to say that *the salvation of moral agents is unconditional*, we will yield the point!—This we say without fear.

No. V.—*The will of God.*—Conclusion.

The editor commences his reply to the fifth number of the rejoinder, in the following extraordinary manner: "Observer in his commencement appears like a man triumphing in a deceptive dream, in which he fancies the 'main bulwarks of universalism,' against which he had frowned in the aspect of a troubled cloud without rain or storm, to have been 'given up without a struggle.'" [Vol. ii, P. 100.] The gentleman's imagination, here, has quite outstriped his judgment. But the brilliancy

of his figures, we trust has not so injured the reader's optic nerve, that he is not able to see that Examiner is quite wide of the mark! How he could make the above representation, unless he was in a "deceptive dream" we are not able to see:—for certainly we intended to say directly the contrary! That we did not expect the main bulwarks of universalism, which we had attacked, would be given up without a struggle, and that we should then proceed to see with what success he had exerted himself in their defence! The reader is now requested to turn back to the fifth number of the rejoinder, [P. 50,] and by reading the first paragraph, he will be prepared to decide how happy the gentleman has been in understanding and representing our words.

He seems to think we have changed our ground: for he says: "It has been a great theme in Observer's arguments, formerly, that it is God's will or disposition to save all, but the reason why all are not saved, is, because his will will not be done. But now he supports that God's 'council will stand, and that he will do all his pleasure.'" (Ib.) We have never denied, but, what is the will of God *absolutely* will certainly take place. The *absolute* will or purpose of God is never frustrated: But what he wills or purposes *conditionally* is often counteracted. In the passage which was under consideration, when we made the remark which he thinks so great a concession, we gave the will of God the *absolute* sense.

He continues: "Now, the reason why all will not be saved, is because 'all things' whom it is the will of God to gather together in Christ, do not embrace every individual of the whole human family." [Ibid.] No sir—this is not the reason why all will not be saved: nor have we given any such reason. Taking the will of God *absolutely* in the passage in question, [Eph, i, 10.] we urged that it still did not prove universal salvation, until a number of things were made out: And one of these, was, that 'the terms *all things*, &c. embrace *every individual*,' &c.—And we still insist that the passage in question does not prove his point until he establishes the particulars which we noticed; and do also deny that this is giving any such reason why all will not be saved as he asserts it to be!

'Gathering together in one all things in Christ,' according to Locke, Macknight and Clarke, refers to the

forming of the believing Jews and Gentiles into one catholic church. But according to Whitby, Doddridge, Wesley, the Continuators of Pool, Coke, and Benson, by *things in heaven*, the angelic hosts are to be understood, and by *things in earth*, believers of all nations: By their being *gathered in one in Christ*, Saints and Angels being at length joined in one great society or church. On either of the above explanations, it will be clearly perceived, that the good pleasure of God's will, may be taken *absolutely* without conceding any thing to our opponent or at all changing our ground.

He has manoeuvred largely to evade our reply to his argument. After varying and modifying his argument, so as to fortify it against our answer, he states the major proposition thus: "The *ultimate* will of God concerning sinners must be done." (Ibid.) And then he supposes us to argue, that because the *ultimate* will of God concerning sinners is not done *now*, therefore it may *never* be done. But this is an incorrect representation of our answer. Suited to the present state of his argument, our answer will stand thus: If the *present* will of God is not done *now*, it is possible that the *ultimate* will of God may not be done *ultimately*.

What we contend for is this: that there is a sense in which *the will of God* is to be taken, which does not imply the absolute *necessity and certainty* of the thing willed. We supposed the existence of *moral evil*, in opposition to the will of God, to be an instance of this kind. And we might bring particular cases: Christ *would* often have gathered the inhabitants of Jerusalem: (Mat. xxiii, 37.) And God has no *pleasure* in the death of the wicked:—(Esek. xxxiii, 11.) And it is the *will of God* that all men should *now* repent: [For he now commands it, (See Acts xvii, 30.) and he cannot command what is contrary to his will!] But the Jews 'would not,' and therefore were not gathered: Examiner allows that the wicked do die: (in some sense.) And how many thousands are this moment impenitent? Now can our Examiner prove that God *wills* the *final salvation* of all men, in any other sense, than he *would* have gathered the inhabitants of Jerusalem:—or *would* not have the sinner die:—or *would* have all men, every where, repent, this very moment? If he cannot his argument from the will of God is a mere rope of sand!

Those effusions of the gentleman, in which he accuses us of Calvinism, skepticism, puerility, and [indirectly] of unbelief and ignorance, require no notice. His system must certainly have been in distress, or he never would have condescended to such wretched means of defence!

We said that 'moral evil as much frustrates the will of God, as the final damnation of the sinner.' His reply to this deserves particular attention: Not because it is so much to the point, as because it shows the extremities to which he is driven. It is this: "Did Observer never think of the circumstances attending the history of Joseph and his brethren? Both these brethren and Jehovah had their designs and meaning in all the transactions of this affecting tragedy—they *meant it for evil* but he for *good.*" (P. 101.) Now if he does not intend by this to prove that the wickedness of Joseph's brethren was according to the will of God, and from this to conclude, that moral evil in general is according to the will of God; we cannot concieve what object he would have in view. But he had previously conceded that "sin is contrary to the will of God!" He has now changed his ground,—or else he is indeed opposing himself as well as us! But as he knows how mortifying it is "to meet with an opponent so identified with mutability:" (P. 100.) perhaps from sympathy for us, he has shifted his premises so much under cover, as if possible, to elude our discovery and save us the *mortification!*—But he need not be exercised by too much regard for our feelings; he may come out boldly and say, that *all sin is according to the will of God!*—This he must do in order to sustain his argument: For if there be one sin in the history of all moral agents, which is not according to the will of God, this is enough for our purpose; from this we would argue: that if the will of God might be counteracted in one case, it might be in another which cannot be shown to be materially dissimilar! When we first took up this subject we argued that the necessary consequence of the universalist argument from the will of God, would be, that *all sin is according to the will of God:* but he disclaimed this consequence altogether: But being pressed with the argument, he indirectly accedes to it, and indeed attempts to support it by the case of Joseph's brethren!

As to this case, we have *thought* of it frequently;—and

perhaps as frequently as even Examiner himself! But we never saw in it what he seems to suppose so obvious. We see no difficulty in supposing that God overruled that wicked act for good, and still the act itself was contrary to his will, and he was in no wise dependent upon it for the accomplishment of his purposes. We cannot see that because God interposed and brought about an event contrary to the wicked designs of those treacherous brethren, and contrary to the natural tendency of their act, he must necessarily be pleased with their perfidious deed? And if the editor should have the temerity to assert this directly he could not make it good!!

Examiner brought forward a number of passages which he supposed afforded "unequivocal evidence" in favor of his doctrine. These we explained in a way which would make them consistent with our system. Now, instead of defending his construction of them, he leaves them, without making any efforts to show that our construction is wrong! But though he deserts his ground, and at a time too when it would be supposed that he ought to be prepared to proceed with energy, he does it with an air of as much triumph as though he had vanquished his foe in fair fighting, and was returning from the field covered with glory, and loaded with the spoils of victory! But we cannot help thinking, under the circumstances, that his triumph is rather premature!!

It would naturally be supposed from the manner in which he closed his examination of the fifth number, that he was prepared to make short work with us. This was indeed the case: For here he *silently* closes his columns against us:—and thus puts a period to the controversy, in his paper! Now which "system," whether ours or his, was "struggling under" the greatest "agony," we are willing to leave to the candid to decide!

We have now done with "*The Candid Examiner*," for the present, In the course of this investigation, we have seen that the system of universal salvation advocated in this publication, excludes the doctrine of pardon: Consequently, as our Lord informs us that the measure of our love to him will be in proportion to the amount forgiven, if we have nothing forgiven we will not love him.

Again: According to this system man is saved on the *ground of suffering* the whole of the punishment which he

ves: This neutralizes the doctrine of atonement—
ers the death of Christ a work of supererogation—
the sinner a claim to heaven on the principles of
e;—and excludes the doctrine of grace, and our ob-
ions to gratitude! According to this scheme salva-
is unconditional—man has nothing to do in the busi-
;—all depends upon divine agency, and we have no
to fear that any thing essential will be left undone!
is live as we list, our eternal interests are perfectly
! On this theory all the divine threatenings are mere
ises of a salutary remedy: Of course they contain
use of alarm to the ungodly!—Nor have we any ev-
e that the editor believes in any punishment after
: The monster in wickedness who dies with murder
s heart, and the most horrid oaths upon his tongue,
go directly to heaven! He who dies by the halter, or
hes in the act of robbery and bloodshed, is made in-
ly blessed: while the pious is left to linger out a life
ferings in this world of woe!! But finally: It has
ared that the grounds taken, to invalidate the doc-
of eternal punishment, if adhered to in relation to
e fundamental doctrines of the gospel, would pros-
the whole, and leave us destitute of hope!!!
candid reader: can this system be founded in truth?
it not sap the very foundation of christianity? And
not its moral tendency be of the most deleterious
acter? We are aware that any enquiry into the *prac-*
efficacy of this system is regarded by its abettors
most, if not quite, sacrilegious:—That nothing so
ates their feelings, and calls forth such severity and
atment. But we are not to be awed into silence
this point by this:—Though we would be far from
tionally giving them unnecessary pain, yet a sense
ty impels us to strip this theory of its mask, and ex-
its native deformity, that the unwary may not be
ht in the snare. Permit us then dear reader to ask
whether you are prepared to launch into the awful
s of eternity upon this broken fragment of a wreck?
est your eternal all upon it? Supposing there were
probabilities in its favor, to *one* against it: would it
ise to expose yourself to *one* chance in *ten* to
l in *everlasting burnings?* Certainly not. In every
of the subject our's is the safe side of the question.

Add to this the weight of evidence in our favor, who that is under the influence of correct views can hesitate? Let any one take the book of God—read it impartially—bow down before the Father of spirits and ask divine illumination:—then lay his hand upon his heart, and decide this awfully momentous question, as he expects to give an account to the Judge of all, and see which side the scale will preponderate.

Though the poisonous weed of universalism has flourished more or less, since it was transplanted from heathen to christian soil, by the heterodox Origin, the plow of truth will finally root it out. "Truth is mighty and must prevail." The church is fast verging toward that glorious period when the corrupt dogmas of men will be dissipated by the glories of gospel truth, like the fog before the rising sun! Oh! come the day, when every refuge of lies shall be swept away, like the baseless fabric of a vision, and leave not a wreck behind! When the watchmen of Zion shall see eye to eye: when truth shall appear in her native loveliness; & the church shall shine forth with refulgent glory, and become the praise of the whole earth.

APPENDIX.

In this article we shall take a brief view of the opinion of the earliest christian writers on the subject of future punishment.

CLEMENS ROMANUS says: "If we do not the will of Christ, nothing will deliver us from eternal punishment."

BARNABAS says: "The way of darkness is crooked, and full of cursing. For it is the way of eternal death, with punishment."

JUSTIN MARTYR says: "The punishment of the damned, is endless punishment, and torment in eternal fire."

In THEOPHILUS, it is "eternal punishment."

IRENIUS in his symbol of faith, makes this one article, that "Christ would send the ungodly and unjust into everlasting fire."

TERTULLIAN says: "All men are appointed to eternal torments or refreshments. And if any man," saith he "think that the wicked are to be consumed, and not punished," let him remember, that hell-fire is stiled eternal, because designed for eternal punishment," & thence concludes; "their substance will remain forever, whose punishment doth so."

ST. CYPRIAN says: "The souls of the wicked are kept with their bodies to be grieved with endless torments."

Lastly, ORIGIN records this among the doctrines of the church: "That every soul, when it goes out of this world, shall either enjoy the inheritance of eternal life & bliss, if its deeds have rendered it fit for life, or it is to be delivered up to eternal fire and punishment, if its sins have deserved that state."

Though Origin gives the above as the doctrine of the church, he took up a different sentiment himself. For in some of his works he advocates the doctrine of restoration from hell. This great man was led estray by his fondness for the Platonic philosophy; the doctrines of which he endeavored to incorporate with the Christian system.

Plato "in the conclusion of his Phædo introduces Socrates, in one of his most serious discourses just before his death, talking after the manner of the poets of *Tartaruss*," &c. 'That some, after having gone through various punishments, shall be purged and absolved, and after certain periods, shall be freed from their punishment.'" (See Leelands Advantages and Necessity of the christian revelation.)

Dr. Mosheim speaking of the doctrine of the church in the third century says: "The christian doctors who had applied themselves to the study of letters and philosophy soon abandoned the frequented paths, and struck out into the devious wilds of fancy. Origin was at the head of this speculative tribe. This great man enchanted by the charms of the platonic philosophy, set it up as the test of all religion; and imagined that the reasons of each doctrine were to be found in that favorite philosophy, and their nature and extent to be determined by it." (See Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I, P. 214.)

Again: "Origin in his *Stromata*, Book x. expresses himself in the following manner: 'the source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or *external* part of scripture. Let us therefore seek after the spirit and substantial fruit of the word, which are hidden and mysterious.' And again; 'the scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.' One would think it impossible that such expressions should drop from the pen of a wise man. But the philosophy, which this great man embraced with such zeal, was one of the sources of his delusion. He could not find in the bible the opinions he had adopted, as long as he interpreted that sacred book according to its literal sense. But Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and indeed the whole philosophical tribe, could not fail to obtain, for their sentiments, a place in the gospel, when it was interpreted by the wanton inventions of fancy, and upon the supposition of a *hidden sense*, to which it was possible to give all sorts of forms. Hence all who desired to model christianity according to their fancy, or their favorite system of philosophy, embraced Origin's method of interpretation." (Ibid. P. 218. Note.)

Mr. Milner says: "There is no doubt, but, in a certain sense, Origin's success was great; but I much fear that

in return, the pure gospel suffered greatly by an admixture of gentilism." (See Milner's History of the church, Vol. I, P. 243.)

Dr. Howeis says: "Indeed even then many of sounder principles disputed his [Origin's] platonic dogmas as heretical; and his own diocean of Alexandria in two councils deposed and degraded him from the priesthood for false doctrines." (See Howeis' Church History, Vol. I, PP. 229 230.)

"The tenets of Origin which gave the most offence, were the following: 1. That in the Trinity, the *Father* is greater than the *Son*, and the *Son* than the *Holy Ghost*. 2. The pre-existence of souls, which Origin considered as sent into mortal bodies for the punishment of sins committed in a former state of being. 3. That the *soul* of Christ was united to the word before the incarnation.—4. That the Sun, Moon, and Stars, &c., were animated and endowed with rational souls. 5. That after the resurrection all bodies will be of a round figure. 6. That the torments of the damned will have an end; and that as Christ had been crucified in this world to save mankind, he is to be crucified in the next to save the devils." (Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I, P. 427. Note.)

We will close our list of extracts, with one which will not only go to confirm what is asserted in the above, with regard to the origin of the doctrine of a *hell purgatory*, but will show the use which was subsequently made of it. Dr. Ree says: "This doctrine of purgatory, which some derive from the platonism of Origin, the montanism of Tertullian, pretended visions, and pagan stories—rhetorical flourishes, and doubtful expressions of the latter fathers, and in which we may discern an obvious resemblance to the famous pagan doctrine, concerning the purification of departed souls by means of a certain kind of fire, was partly introduced at last in the spirit of it, towards the close of the fifth century, and by Gregory the great in the sixth century, but it was not, however, positively affirmed till about the year 1140, nor made an article of faith till the council of Trent." (Ree's New Cyclopædia upon the word purgatory.)

The above extracts we conceive fully justify the following remarks:

1. That the doctrine of the purification of the soul by the fire of hell, originated in the heathen philosophy.

2. That it was with other heathen notions imbibed by Origin, and by him was first propagated in the church.

3. That in order to accommodate the scriptures to these peculiar notions, a plan of explanation was introduced which would accommodate them to any set of notions, tho' the most inconsistent and absurd which were ever generated in a disordered imagination!*

4. That for these innovations in doctrine, Origin was censured by the constituted authorities of the church.

5. That this doctrine of purification by the fire of hell, was subsequently improved into the famous doctrine of *purgatory* as held by the Romish church.

6. That those who argue from the opinion of Origin, that the primitive church held to universal restoration, might, with as much force argue from his opinions, that the primitive church held the absurd notions of the pre-existence of souls,—that the Sun Moon and Stars were animated and endowed with rational souls,—that after the resurrection all bodies will be of a round figure,—and that Christ will be crucified in the other world to save the devils!—For all these notions Origin held.

But finally, we have seen from the most unequivocal testimony of the most learned and pious of the christian fathers, who flourished in the three first centuries, what was the faith of the church in its purest ages, upon the subject in question. Some of these writers were trained up by the Apostles themselves, and others by their immediate successors, and the remainder were but a very small remove from them. Their language goes most conclusively to show, that they understood the scriptures to teach the doctrine of the *eternal punishment of the finally impenitent!* This is strong collateral evidence in our favor. Based then, as we are, upon the word of God and the primitive church, we have nothing to fear. We may 'earnestly contend for' this part of our faith, assured that it constitutes a part of that 'faith which was once delivered to the saints,' and that it rests upon an immovable foundation.

---

*How exactly modern Universalists follow this fanciful plan of explanation, may be seen in the writings of Ballou, Kneeland, &c. &c.

Page.

PREFACE. 3

PART I.

Introductory address to the Editor of the Candid Examiner. 13

No I.—In which the erroneous notions of the Universalists, on the nature and grounds of salvation are considered, 14

No. II.—In which the true notions of the nature, the grounds, and the conditions of salvation are stated and established, 18

No. III.—In which the universalist arguments drawn from the will of God, general atonement, and the general terms often used in relation to the subjects of salvation are considered, 22

No. IV.—Direct evidence in favor of eternal punishment, 26

No. V.—Direct evidence, &c. continued, 32

PART II.

No. I.—Wherein it is considered, whether salvation implies deliverance from the punishment due to sin 37

No. II.—Exemplary punishment—what was the proper penalty of the original law—and whether salvation implies deliverance from it, 43

No. III.—On the doctrine of Atonement, 49

No. IV.—On the conditions of salvation, 54

No. V.—Arguments and scriptures supposed to support universal salvation considered, 60

No. VI.—The argument in favor of eternal punishment founded upon contrast defended, 66

No. VII.—The argument founded upon the strength of the terms defended, 76

No. VIII.—The argument from the strength of the terms resumed, 84

No. IX.—The argument from implication defended, 95

No. X.—The argument deduced from the limitation of the day of grace to this life defended. 106

PART III.

No. I.—The nature of salvation, 115

No. II.—The design of punishment, 123

No. III.—The atonement, 129

No. IV.—Conditions, 133

No. V.—The will of God—CONCLUSION 138

APPENDIX, 145

ERRATA.

In page 1, Motto, for ST. PAUL, read SOLOMON, and for SOLOMON read ST. PAUL.
5, line 31, for *promises* read *promise*.
9, line 1, for *maises* read *mazes*.
Ib. lines 5 & 21, for *Hornby* read *Horsley*.
Ib. line 5, for *of* read *and*.
Ib. line 24. for *absurd* read *obvious*.
Ib. line 30, for *universalianism* read *universalism*.
34, in the note, line 5, for *dieth* read *die*.
75, line 15, for *irrevelant* read *irrelevant*.
Ib. line 33, for *eidences* read *evidences*.
84, line 32, for CRITIRA read CRITICA.
85, lines 26, 28 & 33, for *Ærum* read *Ævum*.
93, line 15, for *that* read *than*.
99, line 17, for *imperfect* read *pluperfect*.
101, line 18, for *Volley* read *Valley*.
122, line 5, after the word *good* read *sense*.
124, line 37, for *on* read *an*.

The following errors have occurred in the course of this work: *Jocephus* for *Josephus*. *Tertalean* for *Tertullian*, *Theopholact* for *Theophylact*, *Tartaruss* for *Tartarus*, *Gomorrow* for *Gomorrah*, *Origin* for *Origen*, and *Irenius* for *Iræneus*. There are still errors in the spelling of some words which are not corrected in this errata.

ACME
BOOKBINDING CO., INC.

NOV 2 2 1983

100 CAMBRIDGE STREET
CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

3 2044 073 505 802

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

*Non-receipt of overdue notices does **not** exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

Andover-Harvard Theological Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-5788

Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve
library c